NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment—Without Compromise.

VOLUME 1. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1840. NUMBER 18.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
AT 143 NASSAU STREET.

NATHANIEL P. ROGERS, Editor.

* **W. C. ROGERS, General Agent.**

☞ To whom Agents, Traveling and Local, will address all letters relating to their agencies.

TERMS.—Two Dollars a year, in advance.

Three Dollars if delayed until the end of the year.

Ten Dollars, in advance, will pay for 7 copies one year, sent to one address.

Twenty-Five Dollars in advance, will pay for twenty copies one year, sent to one address.

WILLIAM S. DORR, Printer.

From the Liberator.

Thomas Clarkson.

Words are too feeble to enable us to express the gratification we feel in publishing the letter of this venerable philanthropist, (received by the Britannia,) condemning the American Colonization Society as a pernicious and visionary association, and explaining the manner in which he was imposed upon by that arch deceiver, Elliot Cresson. The testimony of Thomas Clarkson is now registered with that of William Wilberforce, in reprobating the scheme of African colonization as unworthy of the support of any friend of the colored race. We are sure that every anti-slavery journal in the land will give this letter a prompt insertion in its columns. It is one of the results of our mission to England; and is alone a rich compensation for all the expense and trouble incurred by that mission.

Thomas Clarkson's Renunciation of the American Colonization Society.

To William Lloyd Garrison.

Dear Sir:—When you was in England on a former occasion, you did me the favor to call upon me at Playford Hall, to take a part against the "Colonization Society."—Long before this visit, my friend, Mr. Elliot Cresson, had engaged me in its favor, so that I fear that I did not show you the attention and respect, while you was at my house, due to so faithful an apostle of Liberty. You have lately been in England again, but your numerous engagements prevented you from seeing me, though it was your intention to have done so, and to have conversed with me on the same subject. I understand from your friends in London, who sent me a message to that effect, that you wished to know the particular reasons, why I have changed my mind with respect to that Society. I have no objection to give you a short account of the reasons which induced me to enter into it, and finally to abandon it.

My attention was first drawn to this subject by Mr. Elliot Cresson, who said that there was at that moment an almost universal desire in the people of the United States to abolish slavery and the slave trade, and that he and they had a plan for this purpose. The plan was to emancipate all those then in bondage there, and to send them to Africa, the land of their fathers, where they were to buy land and form colonies, on the principle of civilizing the natives there, of teaching them Christianity, and of preventing the slave trade in their immediate neighborhood, as well as of trying to put an end to it in other parts, wherever their influence might reach. This desire or disposition in the American people to accomplish so glorious a work was, he said, almost universal. It was not confined to the clergy, or persons of superior intellect, or high moral character, but it extended through the various classes of society, even to the planters themselves, who were then deeply convinced of the sin of holding their fellow-creatures as slaves, so that slaves for transportation might be bought for £7 10s. each, (the sum calculated to pay their passage). Many masters were so convinced of the sin of slavery, that they would emancipate, and were then emancipating their slaves, for nothing, that is, without any pecuniary consideration, or on the condition only, that they should be sent to Africa, and comfortably provided for there. Upon this universally prevalent disposition, the Colonization Society was founded, and a district, to be called Liberia, on the Western Coast of Africa, was fixed upon for the purpose. This was the account given me by my friend, Mr. Cresson, and I own that I was overcome with joy, and carried away by it. I thought it was one of the sublimest plans ever devised.—Here the two great evils of slavery and the slave trade were to be done away at one and the same time in the U. States. But that circumstance which astonished me most, was, that there should have broken out all at once, and over the whole land, such a sunshine of benevolent feeling; that men should suddenly, and all at once, have given up long established customs, and the rooted prejudices of ages; and that the hardened hearts of planters should have been all at once melted and softened, and their consciences so smitten, as to have acknowledged slaveholding to be a sin, for which they were anxious to make reparation at a great sacrifice, namely, the free emancipation of their slaves. These feelings on the part of the American people were not to be accounted for upon any ordinary principle. I thought that nothing but the ... of God could have worked such a miracle, and that if it was his will that the blessing of freedom should come to American slaves through the means of the Colonization Society, we were bound most thankfully to accept the boon. My astonishment was so great at this miraculous change of things, that I questioned my friend, Mr. Cresson, over and over again, if his account was not exaggerated. He replied always that it was strictly true. And these were the reasons why I patronized the Society in the very beginning of its formation.

I began now to think very seriously on what had been, at different times, related to me on this subject; and first, how such an immense work was to be accomplished. Nearly two millions and a half of slaves were stated to be then in the United States, and all these were to be transported to Africa. It struck me, that no private funds could be collected by Mr. Cresson, either in England or America, sufficient for this purpose; that it was, in fact, and ought to be, a government work; and I told him my fears that he would never accomplish his object. He told me, in reply, that, besides subscriptions by individuals, the different States in the Union would each give its quota of money towards it, sufficient to transport all the slaves within its own district or boundaries. He then showed me one or two American newspapers, in which it appeared that one of the States, Virginia, I think, had already promised a very large sum, some thousands of dollars, to the work, and he believed that the rest of the States would follow the example. Thus my fears were quieted, as they related to this part of the subject. I do not know whether Virginia has to this day fulfilled her promise.

On going more deeply into this subject, new ideas rose up to my mind. I began to think that if the slaves in the United States amounted to the immense number reported, with the population every day increasing by birth, no man then living might see this good work brought to an end; and that during all this time, that is, during their transportation, all the horrors of slavery would be going on among those who were left behind. I determined, therefore, to satisfy myself on this point; and therefore, when I saw my friend Mr. Cresson next, I inquired what was the then state of Liberia; how many emancipated persons had been already imported into it, and what was the number annually expected to be brought into it. I gathered from him, as far as I can now recollect, that between two and three thousand had already come into it, and that more were on their way thither; but that if I waited a little time longer, he could give me a better answer. I accordingly waited for some months, when I found that the recruits began to come in much more slowly than before, and that, judging by the last importations, or the number then imported in a given time, I could not expect that more than 1000 or 1500, or at the most 2000 emancipated slaves could be then counted upon to be sent annually into Liberia. This alarmed me, and I began to think that some difficulties had occurred in the way of the emigration; either that the funds were then not equal to the transportation of more, or that more could not be procured. Not more than 2000, at most, could be expected to be brought into the colony in a year; whereas not less than 1000 per day should have been sent to that and other parts of the continent of Africa, to get rid of a population of between two and three millions, in any reasonable time. No person, if Mr. Cresson's plan were followed up in such a slow and lingering manner, could hope to see the extinction of slavery in the United States in less than five hundred years, if at all. Nor could they take off, by such a slow process, even the rising generation as they were born. Nor, if the American government were to take the plan into their own hands, could they, in any reasonable time, accomplish the work, were they even to give to the project every shilling of their surplus revenue, in their treasury, and employ their whole navy in the transportation of those people, taking in the rising generations, and all the difficulties which would occur. Even they, the American government, could not accomplish it in less than fifty years. I considered, therefore, Mr. Cresson's plan, so far as related to the removal of these unhappy people, as impracticable within the lifetime of any man then living, and I told him so repeatedly; but I could never get a satisfactory answer from him, nor can any satisfactory answer ever be given to show that the scheme is practicable; and this ought to weigh with those who, if this society still exists, have a desire to enter into it. Let such persons, moreover, consider that this society has already existed, I believe, for eight or nine years, and that there is not a slave less in the United States now, than when they began their work. Indeed, notwithstanding all their efforts during all this time, there are many hundreds of thousands more, in consequence of the increase of population, than when the plan was first proposed; the slave population, according to the best accounts, amounting now to nearly three millions. And I may say further, that, if this society still exists, it is *criminal*; for to hold out that their scheme would produce the entire extinction of slavery in America, (and this was held out with an inconceivable obstinacy,) what was it, or what is it, but to delude the public as well as themselves, and to teach people to rely upon this one measure? whereas, if their scheme had never been proposed, they would have been looking out for some other remedy or cure.

But I began to have other fears, as I looked into the subject further, from a very different view of it. I began to question whether the persons to be sent out, were the proper persons to found a new colony in an uncivilized part of the world, and whether they would not do more harm than good. The natives of Africa, besides being called upon to abolish the slave trade in their own territory, were to be improved in their morals, to be civilized, to be christianized; but were slaves newly emancipated, fit persons to carry on such a work? And yet, by the scheme, such, and such alone except the officers, were to be employed in it. The scheme had reference only to those who were then slaves, and *who were* to be made free on the occasion; that is, just before the sailing of the vessels which were to convey them to their new homes. Now it is obvious, that if these people were to be sent to Liberia, and other parts of the same continent, they would go there with all the vices of slavery upon their heads. Theft, lying, prevarication, and trickery of every kind, are the characteristics of a slave, brought on inevitably by the vicious system under which he had been obliged to live. To this are to be added the brutal and superstitious notions which such people must have; their wants of education, and of any knowledge of civilized life; but, above all, their want of any moral principle to guide them, and their total ignorance of God and religion. Now I did not think that people of this description were fit to be sent to Africa, to form a pattern colony for the imitation of the natives there; for they were no: persons of a pattern conduct themselves. These were my thoughts upon this part of my subject, and I mentioned them several times to Mr. Cresson. He said that, hitherto, he had taken all the care he could to make a selection, but admitted that 120 of this description had come into Liberia amongst the last importations. He candidly confessed that he did not see how he could help himself on a future occasion. Indeed, he spoke only the truth; for the scheme related only to those who were then in bondage, and who, as soon as ever they were emancipated, (however unfit they might be,) were to be the component parts of the new colonies in Africa.

You will see in this narrative my reasons for patronizing at first, the American Colonization Society, and my reasons also for having afterwards deserted it. I left it first, because it was entirely impracticable. This is a sufficient reason of itself; for no man in his senses would pursue a plan, which he thought could never be accomplished. I left it, secondly, because I thought that newly emancipated slaves were not qualified to become colonists in Africa to any good purpose. How could persons be sent with any propriety to civilize others, who wanted civilizing themselves? Besides, the advocates for the Colonization Society in America had no right to send the scum of their population to Africa to breed a moral pestilence there. As far, however, as the abolition of the slave trade concurred in the plan, it must be allowed that Liberia has done a great deal of good. But then, this was the first colony planted, and the people sent there, as Mr. Cresson assured me, were more select. Many of these had been emancipated, a considerable time before, and had got their own living, knowing something of the habits of civilized life. My argument relates only to newly emancipated slaves, who, according to the scheme, were to be hurried off from the plantations as soon as their liberty was given them. If the society did not take these people, then the prospectus, offered to the public, had no meaning in it, and slavery could never, according to its promises, be extinguished in the United States.

Since writing the above, I have learnt from an American paper, that a skirmish has taken place between the colonists of Liberia and the people of Gaytoombah's town. I know nothing of the causes of this apparently little war, but am grieved to learn, when the skirmish was over, that a most wanton, deliberate, cool-blooded act of butchery was practised by the missionaries themselves, who boasted, that while the people of Gaytoombah's town were gathering up their dead, they had the "best chance of any to fire into their groups, and, when they had turned their backs, to pepper their hams with buck-shot." This was too bad, and contrary to the usages of war among civilized nations; but to rejoice in, to boast of, to make a joke of such a murderous deed, belonged only to savages; and yet these men were, we repeat, missionaries, disciples of the Prince of Peace, and perhaps leading men in the colony. What effect such barbarous conduct will have upon the natives, to prevent future colonies from being settled on their coast, we may perhaps live to see. The news of this massacre will certainly be spread by the Kroemen all over the African coast, and the Colonization Society may be deprived of the power of making further purchases in Africa, except in their own immediate vicinity, where they may have done some good. If this should ever be the case, they may bid farewell to their future hopes. Where then will they provide land on this continent for three millions of emancipated slaves?

But I have not done with the subject yet. Mr. Cresson had scarcely left England the last time, when new information was given me on this same subject by two American gentlemen of the very highest moral reputation, by which I was led to suppose two things; either that I had mistaken Mr. Cresson in his numerous conversations with me, or that he had allowed me to entertain erroneous impressions without correcting them. It was true, as my two friends informed me, that there had actually been a great stir or agitation in the United States on this subject, and quite as extensive and general as Mr. Cresson had represented it to be, but that the cause of it was not a religious feeling; as I had been led to imagine, by which the planters had been convinced of the sin of slavery, but a base feeling of fear, which seemed to pervade all of them, and which urged them to get rid of the free people of color by sending them to Africa. These people were more knowing, intelligent and cultivated than the slaves, and, it was believed, were likely to join them, and be very useful to them in the case of an insurrection; so that if these were once fairly sent out of the country, they, the planters, might the more safely rule their then slaves with a rod of iron. This information was accompanied by an account, by way of proof, taken from American newspapers, of different meetings held by the friends of the Colonization Society in different States of the Union, and of the speeches made there. It appeared from these speeches, that the most violent supporters of this society were planters themselves, and that the speakers did not hesitate to hold out the monstrous and hateful proposition, that the negroes were not men and women, but that they belonged to the brute creation. It was impossible to read these speeches, which were so many public documents, and not perceive that the persons then assembled were no friends, but bitter enemies, to the whole African race, and that nothing in the way of good intentions towards the negro could be expected from them. It is unnecessary for me to attempt to describe what my feelings were upon this occasion. I will only say that I saw the scheme—shall I say, the diabolical scheme?—with new eyes, and that the new light thus thrown upon it, added to the two arguments before mentioned, determined me to wash my hands clean forever of the undertaking.

With respect to my dear and revered friend, Mr. Wilberforce, I will tell you what was his opinion on the subject. He saw Mr. Cresson through my introduction, and having heard patiently all that Mr. Cresson had to say in favor of his scheme, put this important question to him:—"Why, when the government of the United States have millions of acres of land, whole States indeed, at their disposal, why do you send them to Africa for a new home, when you can locate them in the country in which they were born, and to which they have a claim by birth-right, and on account of services to the community?" Mr. Cresson never answered this question, so as to satisfy Mr. Wilberforce, and Mr. Wilberforce would not stir a step till it was answered. His opinion was, that if Congress were composed of just and honest men, they would locate these slaves in a territory neighboring to their own, and make a separate State of them, and have them represented on the floor of Congress; or that they would send them to a great distance, making an allied State of them there, and sending proper officers and magistrates with them, to live among them, and to put them into the way of governing themselves. But he gave the preference to the former measure. He always thought that there was something hidden in Mr. Cresson's plan, which was purposely concealed.

I have now given you my reasons for having once patronized the Colonization Society, and then deserted it, and hope you will consider them satisfactory.

I am, dear sir, with great esteem,
Very truly and cordially yours,
THOMAS CLARKSON.

Concluding Chapter of De Tocqueville's Social Influence of Democracy in America.

Before I close for ever the theme that has detained me so long, I would fain take a parting survey of all the various characteristics of modern society, and appreciate at last the general influence to be exercised by the principle of equality upon the fate of mankind; but I am stopped by the difficulty of the task, and in presence of so great an object my sight is troubled, and my reason fails.

The society of the modern world which I have sought to delineate, and which I seek to judge, has but just come into existence. Time has not yet shaped it into perfect form: the great revolution by which it has been created is not yet over; and amid the occurrences of our time, it is almost impossible to discern what will pass away with the revolution itself, and what will survive its close. The world which is rising into existence is still half encumbered by the remains of the world which is waning into decay; and amid the vast perplexity of human affairs, none can say how much of ancient institutions and former manners will remain, or how much will completely disappear.

Although the revolution which is taking place in the social condition, the laws, the opinions and the feelings of men, is still very far from being terminated, yet its results already admit of no comparison with anything that the world has ever before witnessed. I go back from age to age up to the remotest antiquity: but I find no parallel to what is occurring before my eyes: as the past has ceased to throw its light upon the future, the mind of man wanders in obscurity.

Nevertheless, in the midst of a prospect so wide, so novel, and so confused, some of the more prominent characteristics may already be discerned and pointed out. The good things and the evils of life are more equally distributed in the world; great wealth tends to disappear, the number of small fortunes to increase; desires and gratifications are multiplied, but extraordinay prosperity and irremediable penury are alike unknown. The sentiment of ambition is universal, but the scope of ambition is seldom vast. Each individual stands apart in solitary weakness; but society at large is active, provident, and powerful; the performances of private persons are insignificant, those of the State immense.

There is little energy of character; but manners are mild, and laws humane. If there be few instances of exalted heroism or of virtues of the highest, brightest, and purest temper, men's habits are regular, violence is rare, and cruelty almost unknown. Human existence becomes longer, and property more secure: life is not adorned with brilliant trophies, but it is extremely easy and tranquil.—Few pleasures are either very refined or very coarse; and highly polished manners are as uncommon as great brutality of tastes. Neither men of great learning, nor extremely ignorant communities are to be met with; genius becomes more rare, information more diffused. The human mind is impelled by the small efforts of all mankind combined together, not by the strenuous activity of certain men. There is less perfection, but more abundance, in all the productions of the arts. The ties of race, of rank, and of country, are relaxed; the great bond of humanity is strengthened.

If I endeavor to find out the most general and the most prominent of all these different characteristics, I shall have occasion to perceive, that what is taking place in men's fortunes manifests itself under a thousand other forms.—Almost all extremes are softened or blunted: all that was most prominent is superseded by some mean term, at once less lofty and less low, less brilliant and less obscure, than what before existed in the world.

When I survey this countless multitude of beings, shaped in each other's likeness, amidst whom nothing rises and nothing falls, the sight of such universal uniformity saddens and chills me, and I am tempted to regret that state of society which has ceased to be. When the world was full of men of great importance and extreme insignificance, of great wealth and extreme poverty, of great learning and extreme ignorance, I turned aside from the latter to fix my observation on the former alone, who gratified my sympathies. But I admit that this gratification arose from my own weakness: it is because I am unable to see at once all that is around me, that I am allowed thus to select and separate the objects of my predilection from among so many others. Such is not the case with that Almighty and Eternal Being, whose gaze necessarily includes the whole of created things, and who surveys distinctly, though at once, mankind and man.

We may naturally believe that it is not the singular prosperity of the few, but the greater well-being of all, which is most pleasing in the sight of the Creator and Preserver of men. What appears to me to be man's decline, is, to His eye, advancement; what afflicts me is acceptable to Him. A state of equality is perhaps less elevated, but it is more just; and its justice constitutes its greatness and its beauty. I would strive then to raise myself to this point of the Divine contemplation, and thence to view and to judge the concerns of men.

No man upon the earth can as yet affirm absolutely and generally, that the new state of the world is better than its former one; but it is already easy to perceive that this state is different. Some vices and some virtues were so inherent in the constitution of an aristocratic nation, and are so opposite to the character of a modern people, that they can never be infused into it; some good tendencies and some bad propensities which were unknown to the former, are natural to the latter; some ideas suggest themselves spontaneously to the imagination of the one, which are utterly repugnant to the mind of the other. They are like two distinct orders of human beings, each of which has its own merits and defects, its own advantages and its own evils. Care must therefore be taken not to judge the state of society which is now coming into existence, by notions derived from a state of society which no longer exists; for as these states of society are exceedingly different in their structure, they cannot be submitted to a just or fair comparison.

It would be scarcely more reasonable to require of our own contemporaries the peculiar virtues which originated in the social condition of their forefathers, since that social condition is itself fallen, and has drawn into one promiscuous ruin the good and evil which belonged to it.

But as yet these things are imperfectly understood. I find that a great number of my contemporaries undertake to make a certain selection from among the institutions, the opinions, and the ideas which originated in the aristocratic constitution of society as it was: a portion of these elements they would willingly relinquish, but they would keep the remainder and transplant them into their new world. I apprehend that such men are wasting their time and their strength in virtuous but unprofitable efforts.

The object is not to retain the peculiar advantages which the inequality of conditions bestows upon mankind, but to secure the new benefits which equality may supply. We have not to seek to make ourselves like our progenitors, but to strive to work out that species of greatness and happiness which is our own.

For myself, who now looks back from this extreme limit of my task, and discover from afar, but at once, the various objects which have attracted my more attentive investigation upon my way, I am full of apprehensions and of hopes. I perceive mighty dangers which it is possible to ward off—mighty evils which may be avoided or alleviated; and I cling with a firmer hold to the belief, that for democratic nations to be virtuous and prosperous, they require but to will it.

I am aware that many of my contemporaries maintain that nations are never their own masters here below, and that they necessarily obey some insurmountable and unintelligent power, arising from anterior events, from their race, or from the soil and climate of their country. Such principles are false and cowardly; such principles can never produce aught but feeble men and pusillanimous nations.—Providence has not created mankind entirely independent, or entirely free. It is true, that around every man a fatal circle is traced, beyond which he cannot pass: but within the wide verge of that circle he is powerful and free: as it is with man, so with communities. The nations of our time cannot prevent the conditions of men from becoming equal; but it depends upon themselves whether the principle of equality is to lead them to servitude or freedom, to knowledge or barbarism, to prosperity or to wretchedness.

A Letter to Daniel O'Connell.

To Daniel O'Connel, Esq., M. P.:

Excellent Sir:

At the close of the great meeting at Exeter Hall, on Wednesday last, at which his Royal Highnesss the Duke of Sussex, as Chairman, exhibited goodness, grace, and ability, which I believe has never had its parallel in the annals of any earthly monarchy; and in which you yourself poured forth, in strains of natural and simple eloquence, the sentiments of a gifted mind and generous heart, to the delight and instruction of an audience as numerous, perhaps, as ever attended the Areopagus at Athens, or the Forum at Rome, Mr. Gurney invited the company to a Tea-party at the Crown and Anchor, at which the British Abolitionists should take an affectionate farewell of their American and other foreign brethren.

Thither I repaired at about 8 o'clock, in the character of a reporter, and was readily admitted without the stipulated fee. The room was pretty full, principally with members of the Society of Friends, male and female. The moment I had taken out my writing materials, a person, who seemed to be a steward, requested that no notes might be taken for publication. This appeared remarkable in an assembly on such an occasion, when I had heard that Mr. Garrison, the originator of the abolition movement in America, would be present, as well as some ladies distinguished for their purity of character, as well as for their eloquence, who had accompanied him as Deputies from the other side of the Atlantic. I, however, complied, and pocketed my papers.

I found standing on the table a young American, named ——, who uttered with outrageous vehemence a stream of bombast, endeavoring to whitewash his own nation, to make out that they were a great and generous people, although they did buy and sell, and torture black men and women; and, in spite of the fact which I have from a lady who travelled throughout the country, that the *Catholic Cathedral* at New-Orleans, was the only place in the States, either North or South, in which she found white and colored humanity kneeling side by side before the Great Father of all the families of mankind. Sir, what title have even the enlightened philosophers and divines of Boston to the character of Christian men? They will not admit black men into their chapels; they willn ot even be shaved at the same shop with them. Even Rev. Dr. Tuckerman, of Boston, a Unitarian minister, originator of the ministry to the poor in large towns, a man who is boasted of as the American Howard, when in England was at the table of a lady, who had invited among her guests a man of color. The Doctor for some time refused to take his place at the hospitable board, and only did so when our generous and noble-minded countrywoman told him, if she were compelled to part with one of her guests, highly as she honored the Doctor, it must be himself. Sir, the pretext set up for this exclusion is, that an unsavory odor exudes from the skin of the black man. I should like to have the testimony of competent physiologists upon the truth or falsehood of the assertion; I cannot believe it to be true in any degree that cleanness will not obviate.

The Chairman had his programme of speakers, but the call was loud for Mr. Garrison, who, after a little time, mounted the table, declaring that if he spoke at all he would *speak out*. From his remarks I soon found why a published report would not be acceptable. It appears, Sir, that among the Deputies from America, are several *female Friends*, distinguished for zeal and eloquence, who represent the Female Abolition Society; and, to my utter astonishment, I find that the Deputies to this country, a majority of whom are also Friends, one of whose distinguishing tenets is, that they speak under the dictates of the Holy Spirit, which, like the wind, 'bloweth where it listeth,'—these men have, by dint of numbers in the Convention, resolved that *no woman shall be a member* of it. I asked a talented American Friend in the room, what could be the motive of this unmanerly insult put upon ladies and foreigners, visiting our shores for so holy and benevolent a purpose. 'Friend,' said he, 'it is bigotry and priestcraft: Mrs. Lucretia Mott is a member of the *Hicksite* seceders from the American Society of Friends,—a community who think themselves led by the Spirit into views of religion less consistent with what is called orthodoxy, than the old Society; this is 'the head and front of her offending.' The Friend who said this, told me at the same time, that he is himself in doctrine at the very antipodes of Mrs. Mott, but that he knows her genuine worth, and cannot endure that she should be insulted. For this, Sir, are the laws of British hospitality violated, and the British public deprived of an example, than which nothing could be more calculated to improve our minds and manners, by affording a true illustration of the axiom of the apostle, that '*in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female.*' O wretched blindness and folly!!! Sir, we have heard much of the persecuting propensities of the Church of Rome,—much, I am persuaded, that is not only exaggerated, but false; but I have never heard of its perpetrating absurdity like this. Indeed, I am convinced that it is from distinguished minds in the Catholic communion, that we are ultimately to learn the true principles of mental hospitality.

Mr. Garrison revealed this circumstance to the meeting, and said without reserve, that had such a reception been expected, no deputation, either male or female, would have crossed the Atlantic on this occasion; and that indignation at this exclusion had prevented him from taking part in the proceedings at Exeter Hall. Mr. Garrison speaks with clearness and energy, but I think may learn something of true, natural oratory, by his visit to England, which he would hardly acquire in the wild and wordy bombast of his countrymen. He complained that the religious missionaries who had visited the United States had kept entirely aloof from the abolitionists. So deficient ... the company in what we call good manners, that it was with the utmost difficulty that Dr. Hoby, one of those missionaries, could get in a word of explanation. When he was heard, however, I must consider his attempt at vindication an utter failure. Mr. Garrison then attempted to point out some inconsistencies on the part of English abolitionists, and was proceeding to ask, How any one could pretend to love freedom and humanity, who was indifferent to the sufferings of Ireland! when a loud cry arose of '*Question, question, no politics.*' He was supported by a part of the company, who maintained that it was the question, and a very pertinent question—and that abolition itself was a political question. He yielded to the clamor and resumed his place. Mr. Garrison might have added that one missionary to America had not *shyed* the abolition cause; that missionary was a woman. Harriet Martineau, in her zeal for this cause, overcame her womanly reserve, and seconded in a few words a resolution in anti-slavery meeting in Boston; for which she ever afterwards became the subject of gross and bestial insults from the press of that *great, free and enlightened country!!!*—This generous woman was warned that it would be dangerous for her to travel in the South, for fear of Lynch law.—She nobly despised the caution, and visited Calhoun and Clay, and the slavery advocates at their own houses, and resided even in the abodes of Presbyterian ministers, who, with their wives, advocated slavery as a wise ordainment of Providence; and declared that if the blacks should get the uppermost, as the horses did in Swift's sarcastic tale, they would cheerfully consent to be slaves themselves. Shades of Washington and Lafayette, weep for the degenerate nation which your minds and swords redeemed from bondage!!!

The noble colored youth, Mr. Remond, whose pure and lovely eloquence gave us such delight at Exeter Hall, again addressed us. He is decidedly the best of all the American speakers who have come over; his language is pure and expressive English; not a word is out of its place: and his attitudes approach to perfection. He intends taking up his abode in England, in order to escape 'the degrading distinctions by which his noble mind and feeling are constantly wounded in that falsely boasted land of freedom across the water.

The friends of liberality called loudly for Lucretia Mott. *There was opposition to the call:* it was overcome. A little Quaker lady stepped upon the form, and as soon as silence was obtained, poured forth words of sweetness and grace surpassing any thing I ever heard from man or woman.—Her words were words of true wisdom, and uttered with a distinctness, ease, and freedom, united with modesty, that was truly enchanting. I said to myself, 'O that the generous O'Connell could hear this—his heart would glow in admiration!' Feelingly did she remonstrate on the bad usage that had been dealt towards her; yet she expressed her gratitude for such hospitality as she had experienced, in tones of deep feeling; and informed us that, although her voice could not be raised in the Convention, she had received a kind offer from the Rev. Dr. Hutton, (brother of the member for Dublin) of the use of his chapel in Carter-lane, Doctors' Commons, that she might offer a few words there, on Wednesday evening next. Friends had cautioned her, that by using the chapel of a denomination so unpopular as the Unitarians, the cause might be prejudiced. She could not act on such suggestions—the offer had been made to her in a spirit of kindness, and she would gratefully accept it.

Mr. George Thompson, (who I believe is a Scotchman) was loudly called for. He is a most animated and agreeable speaker, and evidently uses the influence his zeal and talents have obtained for him, for the worthy purpose of softening asperities and keeping down turbulence. He spoke ingeniously and well; and concluded with reading a copy of verses. A wish had been expressed in the Convention that some poet of England would appeal to the ministrels in the United States, and call on them to awake their harps in strains that might burst the spells that bind down the sympathies of humanity which lie unrevealed in the American heart. The call has been answered. Mr. Thompson read, with beautiful and varied cadence, a copy of verses to that effect, couched in 'words that burn.' Every hearer was dumb with admiration. But one sentiment prevailed throughout the assembly. Every one felt and said, 'No other man than Thomas Campbell could have written these verses.' But our conjecture, though it had all the force of conviction, was erroneous. The lines are the production of Dr. Beattie, a poet whose modesty has concealed his name from several productions of superior merit. The lines are to be printed for general circulation.

I should have mentioned, in its proper place, that Mrs. Mott uttered, in tones evidently of deep-felt fervor, her admiration of the efforts in the cause of humanity, of him, who has heretofore been called the Liberator of Ireland; but who merits the higher title of the Liberator and the Friend of Man.

Generous Sir, you will weep—angels might weep, at the intrusion of sectarian feelings, to sully the great cause in which we are now engaged. It must be suppressed—it must be exterminated. The services you have rendered to humanity; the increasing popularity which attends on your voice and your steps, as you become every day better known and more justly appreciated by the people of England, gives you a power for good greater than I have ever known to be possessed by any other man. That power I am sure will be exercised to the extermination of bigotry and uncharitableness, whenever, and in whichsoever of its Proteus shapes it may appear.

Accept, Sir, the unbribed confidence and veneration of

DAVID BRENT PRICE,
Burgess of Portsmouth, Freeholder of South Hants; and by the grace of God, Missionary for Truth, Freedom and Humanity.

City Coffee-House, Farringdon street, June 26, 1840.

P. S. Since the above was written, I have learned by painful experience, that although there is undoubtedly in the British Metropolis much liberality of mind, there is also much bigotry and uncharitableness. I called on Mr. Seeley, bookseller, of Fleet-street, to ask him to sell the Report which I have published of the Proceedings of the Anniversary of the Society for protecting the Natives in the European Colonies. Young Mr. Seeley said he knew not who the aborigines were. I explained to him. He then asked who were the moving parties. I mentioned Mr. Buxton, Mr. Mackinnon, Mr. Evans and others, until I came to the name of Dr. Bowring; the first sound of which was quite enough. He instantly said, 'O Sir, we can have nothing to do with the matter,—we beg you will not, on any account attach our names to the work!'

Letter from Elizabeth Pease.

Liverpool, September 3, 1840.

My Dear Friend:

We are anxiously and joyously anticipating the return of the "Acadia," to bring us tidings of your safe arrival.

We have been at Manchester for the last ten days, having spent but *one week* at home since we parted—the long desired meeting summoning us back, ere we had well tasted the sweets of quiet. However, we have been amply repaid. It gave us the opportunity of bidding farewell to our excellent friends, the Motts, and their companions—and the meeting was truly a delightful and encouraging one. But I need not dwell on it, as C. L. Remond has described it so well. The papers do justice to none of the speeches. A better report will be out soon, in a pamphlet. The result affords good ground for hoping that this magnificent question will be vigorously prosecuted in the most important town in the kingdom. A good sound committee is formed, and Joseph Adshead engaged as Secretary. We regard it as a circumstance, almost providential, that such a man should be ready and willing to enter into the subject. He does so with his whole heart, and with a deep conviction of its immeasurable importance to humanity, the world over. He is now here, endeavoring to prepare the way for George Thompson to deliver a course of lectures. We left our dear friend in Manchester, busy, preparing the pamphlet, and an address to the British people, which the committee wish to append to it. He suffered greatly from the meeting. It was crowded almost to suffocation, and he spoke upwards of an hour and a half.

It gives me great pleasure to enclose the letter of Thomas Clarkson on the Colonization Society. He gives some little credit to the Society, in some respects, instead of treating it as a superstructure of pure, unmixed evil; yet, as a whole, it is strong and excellent, in our opinion, and I hope it will give thee satisfaction, and be of essential service, in exposing the machinations of its agents.

We had, last week, the privilege of several hours of the company of that benevolent and wonderful man, Daniel O'Connell. He has given proof of his interest in the India question, by tearing himself away from his pressing engagements in Ireland, at a crisis so important to the cause which is nearest his heart. There are few who can say with equal truth, "my country is the world, my countrymen are all mankind." His spirit practically acknowledges the universal brotherhood of man—notwithstanding his first duty as he rightly conceives, refers to the oppressed in his own land. Whilst conversing on India, he wrote upon a dozen cards, nine or ten of which I send to Mrs. Chapman for the Fair, feeling well assured they will be valued.

Believe me ever most truly thy friend,
E. PEASE.

From the Friend of Man.

The Annual Meeting of the New-York State Anti-Slavery Society.

We have only room for a condensed statement of the principal features of the Convention.

From intimations thrown out in certain quarters, beforehand, we had reason to expect that the course of the Executive Committe, and of the "Friend of Man" in favor of independent nominations, would encounter determined opposition at the Annual Meeting, and in this we were not disappointed. The Annual Report which was read on the morning of the first day, Wednesday, laid open the whole subject for action. To adopt it, in the meeting, would be to commit the Society in favor of independent nominations. A series of resolutions, reported, at an early hour, by the Business Committee, covered the same ground, and approvingly responded to the nomination of Messrs. Birney and Earle by the Albany Convention, and of Gerrit Smith and C. O. Shepard at the Syracuse Convention. The resolutions and the Annual Report were opposed by a number of speakers, and sustained by others, and the discussion occupied the afternoon and evening, till a late hour, saving a few minutes, devoted to the choice of officers for the year ensuing. At 8 o'clock in the morning of the next day,—Thursday, the subject was resumed and continued till 10 o'clock, which hour had been appointed for attending to the Treasurer's Report, and to the raising of funds. After hearing the Report which occupied but a few minutes, it was soon ascertained that nothing could be done in the way of raising funds until the policy and operations of the Society should be first settled. The discussion was therefore, in substance, resumed, on the introduction of a resolution prohibiting the Executive Committee to use the funds of the Society for "the publication of extra papers and hand bills, to aid in the support of an independent anti-slavery ticket, at the election." This resolution was lost by an overwhelming majority. One of the test resolutions reported the day previous, in favor of the policy of independent nominations was then up, and adopted by a very large majority, and the meeting adjourned till 2 P. M. The subject of funds was then resumed and about $500 was collected and subscribed. The adoption of the Annual Report was then moved. This was the signal for renewed opposition, in the form of a regular built Tippecanoe speech, from one of our "moral suasion" clergymen, to which the Society listened with exemplary patience and some degree of amusement, till between 4 and 5 P. M., when "the question" was called for, and the Annual Report was adopted by nearly a unanimous vote. After all this, another of the reported resolutions of the day previous, responding to the nominations of Birney and Earle and Smith and Shepard, was contested, so far as a State ticket is concerned, by a brother who informed us that he "goes upon the same plan upon which he has voted for the last 20 years." The merits of Wm. H. Seward, the present Governor, were adduced by another gentleman as a reason why no new State ticket should have been made. The resolution was however adopted with great enthusiasm, a very few voices only being heard in the negative. Other resolutions were then adopted, on a variety of subjects.

The evening was occupied chiefly in the discussion of resolutions showing the intimate connection between the "hard times" and the ascendency of the slave power. Mr. Samuel Webb, of Philadelphia, instructed the audience with some statesmanlike views on this subject.

It will be seen that the protracetd discussion on independent nominations, which resulted from the persevering opposition of a very small minority, compelled the Convention to condense its other business into a smaller space than could have been desired. It will be seen, however, when the resolutions and minutes are published, that the Convention were not unmindful of other topics. There was a strong resolution adopted, on ecclesiastical action, corresponding to the tone of the Annual Report on that subject. Another on prejudice against color, as manifested in legal disabilities, efforts for expatriation, obstacles in the way of education, and the negro pew. Hiram Wilson and the fugitives were not forgotten, nor the efforts of Vigilance Committees and others who aid the fugitives' flight. East India slavery, and the London Convention, and the efforts of our worthy representative, James C. Fuller, in that Convention, and in raising funds for the Canada fugitives, while in England, were not overlooked—though we regret that through the absence of Mr. Fuller, on the last evening, the audience were deprived of the pleasure of hearing a statement from his own lips. A resolution was adopted, recommending the Colored American to the patronage of our friends. The Society voted that the Friend of Man be enlarged, if the Executive Committee could obtain the requisite funds.

A letter was received from our beloved President Gerrit Smith, who is now in Philadelphia, and under the care of physicians, requesting that in consequence of his state of health and pressing cares, the Society would excuse him, at present, from serving as President. The Convention very reluctantly came to the conclusion that it would be unkind and ungrateful to refuse a compliance with the request. Alvan Stewart, Esq., of this city, was accordingly chosen President in his stead.

The number of delegates and members in attendance we should judge to be about the same as usual, after making allowance for the absence of a representation from the eighteen western counties now composing the N. Y. Western Anti-Slavery Society.

We ought to be grateful for the frankness and honesty with which, in several instances, the opponents of independent nominations stated their objections. Except in one or two cases, it was plain that "other interests" were preferred to those of the slave, and the argument of some, went to prove that the enterprise of abolishing slavery might as well be abandoned. Spencer Kellogg, Esq., late Chairman of our Executive Committee, went so far as to say "it would do no good even if our new party should gain a majority in the free States, because, said he, the representatives of the slave States in Congress, would stand by slavery, and would never consent to its abolition in the District and Territories, or the prohibition of the internal slave trade. It would rend the nation into fragments to attempt it."—"Sir," said he, "slavery can never be abolished in the District of Columbia and Territories, nor can the internal slave trade be abolished by your efforts. They can only serve as a hobby horse to ride into power."

Why then petition Congress? Why question the candidates? Why give scattering votes?

ous that if it be a natural right, it is a right common to all, that is, if it be right for A to force B to be his slave, it is equally right for B to force A to be his; and it must resolve itself into this, that he who has the most power is to be the master—in which case right will only be enjoyed during the continuance of power, and A may be B's master to-day and his slave to-morrow, just as the one or the other may enforce his claim. But if both have the same right it follows that when A is master, then B's right is disregarded, and A is unjust in keeping B out of his right. It would be absurd to say, that a horse has any right to make a man his servant. Why? Because nature gives man the dominion There is no equality of right in this case. But between man and man nature has drawn no such distinction. We cannot speak of justice between a horse and a man; but what nature gives to one man, another cannot forcibly appropriate to himself without an act of injustice. So far, therefore,—from reason teaching the right of man to hold his fellow-man as property, the proposition itself is an absurdity, for if it be the natural right of one man, it must be the natural right of every man, and as every man cannot be a master, it follows that nature confers a right upon one portion of the human family, to nullify the natural rights of another portion. Apart then from the Bible we have no argument that justifies perpetual involuntary servitude. Nay, the common sense view of the subject is altogether against it. The consciences of the American people, as expressed in their Declaration of Independence, is against it. The natural love of liberty inherent in man is against it. The very instincts of our nature is, that man is born for freedom.

Such being the case, such the natural or common sense conclusions of the human mind, it ought to take a great deal of just criticism to satisfy us that the *Bible* sanctions slavery. In other words, we ought to enter upon the Scriptural examination of this subject with our common sense impressions fairly before us, lest we allow ourselves to give an interpretation to the Bible that will make it speak sentiments so at variance with these natural impressions, as to give occasion to infidels to scoff at the Bible, and to others an irreverance for its authority. Yet if the Bible does sanction slavery, it will then become us to review our common sense impressions, and yield them to the higher authority of the Word of God. But if the Bible may bear an interpretation unfavorable to slavery, it will become us to adopt such interpretation rather than any other, because we shall then have the Bible in harmony with our reason. Those who are familiar with the Bible must know that various interpretations may be frequently given to the same text. And such is the remarkable character of this sacred volume, that the most opposite conclusions are arrived at by different denominations on the most vital points. For instance, one says that the Bible teaches the doctrine of universal salvation, another that only a part of the human family will be saved. One teaches the doctrine of the Trinity, another opposes it; and both appeal to the Bible with equal confidence.—Now let not this thing shake our faith in the Bible, but let it put us upon our guard that we be not confirmed in error by the plausibility of an argument drawn from the sacred Scriptures. I once read the Bible with all my prejudices so favorable to slavery, that I readily interpreted it on that side of the question; but when I now read this good Book, I wonder at my former expositions. I now feel satisfied that the Scriptures condemn slavery; and yet I believe I was sincere in my former opinions, and I am no less sincere in my present views. This has led me to examine the Bible upon some other subject, and I find I can argue from it in favor of polygamy with just as much speciousness as in favor of slavery. Yet who is willing to believe that the Bible sanctions polygamy! Yea, if I were wicked enough, I might quote the Bible in favor of lying, and it would require some critical [illegible] to aid a common reader against the force of my quotation. It is important, therefore, that we be very guarded against false yet specious interpretations of the Word of God. The truth is, we might say that it depends upon the degree of our spiritual feelings on a subject, whether we give a correct interpretation or not. I will illustrate this by an instance.—One man reads this text, "Whoso provideth not for his own and especially those of his own house, hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel," and he supposes it authorizes him to make property for his family. Another reads the same, and his spiritual mind leads him to receive it as a direction to contribute of what he has to the support of his poor relations, which the other never dreamed of. The wrong interpretation therefore is, not because the Bible is ambiguous, but because there is something deficient in the character of the reader. A very spiritually minded reader will give that interpretation which will be most at war with his carnal affections and wishes. I hope this suggestion will be borne in mind throughout the whole of our present investigation;—and God grant us, both writer and reader, spiritual illumination.

Canaan's Curse

Genesis ix. 25, 26, 27. "And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. And he said, Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant."

"A servant of servants," is a phrase that implies the most abject kind of servitude, and I shall therefore not rely here upon the indefiniteness of the term, servant. It is in my own opinion a prophecy that slavery would exist. But does such a prophecy sanction slavery, when there is no crime which demands such a punishment! Let it be observed, it is pronounced upon Canaan as a curse, a punishment for the crime of exposing his father's nakedness. Is it not the dictate of humanity to seek mercy for those who have exposed themselves to God's curse! If not, why do Christians seek the conversion of souls! But all must admit that it is the duty of a Christian to do all in his power to procure every good and every blessing for all mankind. The Christian is enjoined by the Apostle, to seek "not his own, but others' wealth." A prophecy is not a command, and places no one under obligation. If a prophecy is made it is made by the inspiration of God, who makes use of even the wickedness of men to accomplish his designs and to punish their fellow-sinners; and mere prophecy that any thing will be, is not a proof that the thing itself is right.—Else the Egyptians were perfectly right in oppressing the Israelites, since such oppression was predicted, and predicted too, when God was actually blessing Abraham.

In Deuteronomy xxviii. 30, "Thou shalt betroth a wife and another man shall lie with her," is the declaration of God, but does this make the adultery justifiable!

Again. Deut. xxviii. 53, "Thou shalt eat the fruit of thine own body, the flesh of thy sons and thy daughters which the Lord thy God hath given thee, in the seige and in the straitness wherewith their enemies shall distress thee."—Does all this justify such cruel warfare!

The crucifixion of our Savior too, was justifiable on the same principle. God promised Abraham that through his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed, and this it was prophesied would be accomplished by the Jews piercing the Messiah. Accordingly, to fulfil this blessing, Jesus of Nazareth being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, the Jews by wicked hands did crucify and slay. Did the prophecy in this case justify the deed! Neither does the prophecy respecting Noah and his sons, justify slavery. And as the text makes it evident that slavery is a curse, so it becomes a Christian to seek the deliverance of his brother from that curse.

Abraham's Servants.

Abraham had many servants; but assuredly it was a patriarchal servitude. There is nothing in the history to give an idea of such slavery as we are discussing. He had three hundred and eighteen servants trained to arms, and who fought his battles. One of his servants would have hired his property if he had had no child of his own. Those born in his house, and those bought with his money, were treated as his family. When Hagar became an offence to Sarah, she did not urge Abraham to sell her, as modern mistresses would do; but to "cast out the bond woman and her son: for the son of this bond woman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac." And she was accordingly sent off, not sold. But even this patriarchal servitude is noticed only as matter of history—not as something sanctioned by God, or in accordance with the principles of justice and right. Who will now defend concubinage, because Abraham practised it? Or who would justify lying, because Abraham denied his wife to Abimalech, and yet received no rebuke from the Lord for it? Neither should the mere existence of patriarchal servitude justify it.

Joseph's Bondage.

Joseph's case represents precisely that of Africans forced to America. His brethren sold him as Africans do their brethren. American traders bring slaves here as the Midianites carried Joseph into Egypt. His brethren themselves said, "We are verily guilty concerning our brother." But mark how Joseph speaks of his bondage. "I was stolen," says he, "away out of the land of the Hebrews." Here the Midianites are included as well as his brethren, as guilty of the theft. His brethren were literally the first robbers—they sold him to the passing merchantmen, and these traders brought him out of the land of the Hebrews into Egypt, having paid their money for him; and yet Joseph says he was stolen out of the land. He makes no distinction between the purchaser and the thief.

Bondage of the Israelites

The Israelites, reduced to want by famine, were invited into Egypt and became subject to bondage. They voluntarily came—they sold themselves to Pharaoh for corn.—We have no evidence that their bondage was more rigorous than that of American slaves; yet the Lord required Pharoah to give them up, and sent grievous plagues upon him for retaining them in his service. All this history carries evidence against the moral right in slavery. It is unnecessary to dwell upon it.

I might multiply into a volume quotations from writers whom the civilized world has been accustomed to venerate for their talents, their wisdom or their piety, to bear testimony to the sinfulness of slavery. These men were no fanatics. They were men of thought, and men whom slaveholders themselves are accustomed to venerate.—Here are then Episcopalians, Methodists, Catholics, Baptists, Presbyterians, Lawyers, Statesmen, Military chieftains, presenting in the list I have introduced to my reader a splendid galaxy of talent, all combining to pronounce slaveholding a SIN.".

And if it be a sin, what ought to be done? Who is willing, that calls himself a Christian, to be instrumental in perpetuating this sin! If slavery be a wrong and outrage on the rights of man, who is willing, that has any nobility in his soul, any spark of the spirit of liberty in his bosom, any benevolence in his heart, any justice in his principles, to continue such a system of oppression? If ignorance, or thoughtlessness, or habit has heretofore prevented an examination of this subject, surely the light is shining too brightly around us now to have a conscience void of offence towards God. The very effort made to shut out this light will be brought in judgment against us. Shall considerations of human policy, hinder us from doing justice to those we have injured? Shall the fear of man hinder any Christian from raising his voice against oppression? Shall the apprehension of poverty deter a Christian from doing justice to those whom he has heretofore in his ignorance kept in bondage? Ye followers of the blessed Jesus, rouse up for shame, cry aloud and spare not—show to Israel their trangressions and to the house of Jacob their sins. Participate no longer in this crime of a wicked world. It is you, brethren in Christ, who are sustaining this mass of wickedness and oppression. Let ministers do their duty in this matter, let Christians abandon all participation in, and refuse all countenance to this unhallowed system, and our beloved country will soon cease to be the land of oppression, and the penitentiary of Africa's sons.

I am not ashamed or afraid to say I am an Abolitionist. The time is rapidly coming, when the odium attached to this name will cease, yea, man will glory in the title. It will soon be found out, that the principles of the Abolitionists are not what their enemies have represented them. There may be ultraists and fanatics among them it is true, for this is the misfortune of every community and of every party. But it must be known ere long, that there are moderate, and thoughtful, and wise men to manage and conduct the moral forces that must be brought against this terrible system of outrage upon the rights and liberties of man.

Abolitionists were called incendiaries. Brethren, do not any longer be deluded by false charges against the character of those whom designing men would induce you to hate. Read the Constitution of the Anti-Slavery Society and see if there be any thing incendiary there.

They are accused too of setting at defiance the Constitution of the United States. Read for yourselves the authorized writings of the Abolitionists, and you will see that this too is a calumny.

The Abolitionists know the United States government have no right to abolish slavery in the States. Nor do they seek to interfere with the political rights of any of the Southern States. They hope however, as there is power in truth, to convince the South, by argument addressed, not to slaves, but to masters, that slavery is a moral evil, yea a sin and ought to be abandoned. This they are bound to by every principle of philantrophy and of that holy religion by which the disciples of Jesus are authorized to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.

It is because I feel that slavery is a sin that I have abandoned it, and it is because I wish my brethren who are masters to be free from sin, and my brethren who are slaves to be delivered from their bonds, that I am an Abolitionist.—And God will judge when masters and and slaves, Abolitionists and Anti-Abolitionists all stand before his bar to whom the language of Jesus will best apply, "I was in prison and ye visited me not."

Disgraceful Conduct.

In the last number of the Liberator, we gave an account of a meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, which was held in that city on the 7th of August. An adjourned meeting was held on the evening of the 10th, which was interrupted in its proceedings by the Chartists in the following disgraceful manner. We copy the account from the Glasgow Argus.—*Lib.*

Mr. Lloyd Jones, the missionary of the Socialists in Glasgow, rose to address the meeting, and was received with mingled applause and disapprobation. It now became obvious, what had been strongly suspected from the commencement, that in the church there was a strong muster of Socialists and Chartists, assembled for the purpose of thrusting their peculiar opinions and crotchets upon the meeting; and, at the same time, judging from past experience of the doings of the Chartists, it was not difficult to perceive that further progress in the advertised and proper business of the evening was at an end. It is not, of course our intention to fill our columns with the speeches spouted on this occasion by the Socialist and Chartist leaders, full as they were of ignorant assumption, misrepresentation, and absurdity. Even though every word had come with the authority of holy writ, they were so much out of place, so utterly at variance with the object of the meeting, that we would have done wrong in giving publicity to a single sentence; and were it not necessary, for the proper understanding of what occurred, the presence of the insolent intruders would not be even mentioned by us. On this occasion the Chartists of Glasgow outstripped every previous exertion they had made to render themselves odious to their fellow-citizens. They not merely broke in upon the business of a society, called together for a specific purpose, and forced upon that society resolutions foreign to its object, but they demeaned themselves in a way so coarse and unmannerly as to excite the indignation, if not even the disgust, of the quiet and reasonable portion of the audience. Venerated and respected ministers of the Gospel, long celebrated for their activity and zeal in every good and philanthropic work, and at that moment engaged in the most beneficent of purposes, were insulted and vilified—their honesty and truth impugned—the nature even of their Sabbath preaching denounced—and all respect for their persons and character thrown aside. Howling, hooting, groaning, and hissing, were kept up with scarcely any intermission after the opposition began; and, at a particular period of the evening, the rush made into the church by a host of Chartists, who had just left a meeting in St. Ann's, was such as to fill the minds of many with fear. We have been credibly informed that, when this band of Chartists were entering the church, several cries were heard of 'burn them out,' 'tear down the church,' and expressions of a similar nature. Of course, these must have been the outpourings of some senseless, unthinking blockheads; but their utterance sufficiently accounts for the alarm which was created.

While we give, in the conclusion, a lady detail of what occurred, let the reader just suppose himself in the midst of an immense crowd, a majority of whom keep up a constant howl, either of approbation or disapprobation, groups bickering in every quarter for each other's faces, and shaking antagonist fists as if ready to fight—a perpetual use of offensive exclamations towards some one or other of the speakers—an occasional oath too—and then he will have some idea of the scene exhibited on this occasion.

Mr. Lloyd Jones, Socialist, after attempting to show that the factory children of this country were as much slaves as the blacks of North America, moved an addition to Mr. Harvey's resolution, to the effect that they should exert themselves also in behalf of the factory slaves.

A person, whose name did not transpire, seconded this amendment; and, in the course of a few remarks, gave rather a hard slap at the mover of the amendment, by observing that infidelity was the cause of all our evils.

Dr. Wardlaw, after observing that the meeting had been called for a special purpose, and that the objects contemplated in the amendment should be the subject of a distinct meeting, moved that the business do proceed.

Mr. George Thompson, in an eloquent speech, supported this motion, and showed clearly the difference between the two objects, and the propriety of keeping them distinct,—pledging himself at the same time to attend any meeting called on the subject of the factory children, and to denounce any thing that might be proved wrong in the system.

Another amendment was moved by a Mr. Jack, said to be secretary to some one or other of the universal suffrage associations. He moved the adoption of universal suffrage in this country as the most direct means of abolishing slavery in America; for, quoth he, if we had universal suffrage, we would put a heavy duty on American slave grown cotton, and encourage the growth of cotton in India, and then down would come the whole system of slavery.

Mr. O'Neil seconded the amendment.

Mr. Remond, in a few sentences, expressed a hope that, whatever resolution was come to, that meeting would at least show itself thoroughly anti-slavery, and the advocate of universal emancipation.

After one of the most noisy and irregular discussions we have ever seen, the matter was ultimately brought to the vote, when, as was expected, the Chartists carried their additions by a great majority.

Mr. Thompson then stated it as his firm and honest conviction, that the resolution, as carried, had not been carried by the members of the Glasgow Emancipation Society—a statement which gave rise to renewed disorder and discussion.

In consequence of the lateness of the hour, and the exertions he had already undergone, Mr. Thompson was unable to proceed with his speech on the subject of British India; a circumstance which called forth the regret of every person having the welfare of the cause at heart.

Under these circumstances, an adjournment to a future evening took place, a vote of thanks having been previously given to Mr. Beith, for his conduct in the chair.

The following are the resolutions that were adopted at the two meetings above alluded to:

That the improved condition and character of the emancipated population in the British Colonies, most satisfactorily illustrate and confirm the soundness of the views entertained by the friends of immediate abolition, and call for renewed expressions of thankfulness and congratulation; that the experience of the past, and that the present state of the anti-slavery cause, furnish motives of the most affecting and at the same time sustaining nature, to prosecute, with undiminished ardor and hopefulness, the great work of UNIVERSAL EMANCIPATION, till the fetter of every slave be broken—the Continent of Africa delivered from the horrors of the slave trade, and the *unnatural and wicked prejudice against color* is entirely eradicated.

Whereas, Slavery, under every modification, is a daring insult to God, who made man in his own image, a glaring outrage on all the rights of humanity, and expressly condemned by the precepts and spirit of Christianity, this meeting regard not only those who hold slaves as deeply guilty, but likewise all who neglect to use the influence which they possess to discourage or suppress it, as partakers in the sin.

Wherefore Resolved,

I. That we now pledge ourselves to use all our influence, in every relation in life, to put an end to slavery; and earnestly to remonstrate with those (be they Britons or Americans) who either retain their fellow men in bondage, or make gain by the infamous system of slavery.

II. That this meeting earnestly and affectionately entreat the Christian Churches in Great Britain and Ireland, of all denominations, through their ministers and members, to remonstrate, as opportunity presents, through their Church courts, or other religious organizations, according to their own forms, with the American Churches and brethren, on the guilt they incur—the injury they inflict on religion—and the dishonor they do to God, by retaining slaveholders in their communion, and to urge them by all the motives presented by their common faith, to give no countenance to this monstrous evil, but to put away from their religious fellowship every man who holds his fellow-man in bondage, as they value the Divine favor, the interests of religion, and the rights of humanity.

On the preamble and resolutions being put to the meeting, the following clauses were proposed on behalf of a large body of Chartists present, as additions, and were pronounced by the Chair to be carried by a majority of the meeting. Mr. George Thompson protested against said clauses being considered as adopted by the members of the Glasgow Emancipation Society. The first clause was proposed by Mr. Lloyd Jones,—the Socialist Missionary:—viz.

And that the owners of our large manufacturing establishments be particularly requested to immediately render their assistance in making such alterations in the insitutions of this country, as that infant slavery may at once be abolished.

The second clause was proposed by Mr. Jack: viz.

That while we take every opportunity of hastening the Emancipation of the Slaves of America, and all other parts of the world, we direct the Committee to take every opportunity of urging the Government of Britain to take immediate steps for advancing the condition of the people of this Country, morally, physically, and politically, by passing a law, granting the right of the suffrage to every man of sane mind, unconvicted of crime, who has obtained the years of his majority.

From the Watchman and Wesleyan Observer.

Cornwall Bridge, Conn.

Friend Editor,—The following is from a letter prepared by Curtis Beers, of Cornwall Bridge, for the Watchman. After it was sent to be mailed, some of the parties concerned in countenancing the mobs referred to in the letter, told him if he would recall the letter, they would immediately proceed to apprehend Pangman and his associates. He recalled it accordingly, but as those most guilty, can, I think in this case be reached most effectually through the rebuke of the press, I considered it best to send the copy for publication. By giving it a place, you will oblige,

Yours for the slave,
ABBY KELLEY.

New Milford, Aug. 31, 1840.

COPY.

Cornwall Bridge, Aug. 2, 1840.

Brother Sunderland,—Having, for some time past, listened to the cry of your Watchman, and heartily responded to its faithful warnings, by endeavoring to extend its principles, both by obtaining subscribers and in various other ways, I now take the liberty of addressing you a letter to be laid before your readers, if you shall see fit, giving some account of local matters, but which may be of general interest, as they are of general application.

We had thought, that in this quiet region, and at this late period in the anti-slavery discussion, we should find no let or hindrance to the peaceful holding of our meetings. There has never been much of the mobocratic spirit manifested here, but we did not attribute its absence to the right cause. Our meetings have been small, and the community have never been much aroused. We, of course, knew here was considerable opposition felt, but did not think it violent.—When I look around, and see the course that has been pursued on all hands, I find I had no reason to think there was not bitter and deep, and murderous opposition to our principles. The clergy dumb—the church in intimate fellowship with slavery, the whole community giving their countenance to it. We were undeceived as to our true position, by our sister Abby Kelley, coming into Litchfield county, to plead the cause of the dumb. In most places where she has been, she has given several lectures, which, from the novelty of a lady's public speaking, and the faithfulness with which she has applied the truth, have drawn out larger audiences than we have ever been able to collect before. This has roused the demon of slavery. He was comparatively quiet while he saw the apathy was not much broken up, but now, when it was broken, he mustered his forces, and has battled with his wonted energy for his invaded territory. I will give an instance. Miss Kelley came to South Cornwall, a place celebrated for the sobriety of its inhabitants, and gave a lecture at short notice on Monday Evening. The meeting was not large, although larger than the anti-slavery meetings in this vicinity have usually been, and it was pretty quiet. The next meeting was much larger and was considerably disturbed by some young men who have recently been converted to a slaveholding religion, and have united with a pro-slavery church. The civil officers of the place, although not abolitionists, gave out word that they would not allow any meeting to be disturbed, and by their efforts, at the next meeting, comparative quiet prevailed.—Now, it was, that "the dark spirit of slavery" failing in some of its instruments, called others who had before been passive, into active service. The former minister of the place, Mr. S with others of his family, and other members of the Congregational church, put many reports in circulation for the purpose of (it is supposed,) destroying Miss K's. influence. They stated that the Quakers rejected the Bible, and that Miss K. was a Quaker, and a *very bad woman*—that if she prayed, it was merely for a cloak to cover her wicked designs. These reports gave the mob renewed courage, and at the fourth meeting missiles were thrown through the windows and the ladies were insulted by the most obscene language. A fifth meeting was appointed to be held at same place, the conference came, but a military company was called out to occupy it, and so prevent the meeting, but a worthy citizen opened his house for it. The military company, after marching back and forth past the house, drumming, firing, &c. retired, having called out a full mobocratic force. The meeting was continually interrupted through the evening, notwithstanding all the efforts of the civil officers, and at length one of the officers was attacked and struck, by a miscreant, and otherwise shamefully insulted. The testimony of the civil officers and of all the friends of good order, as well as of the abolitionists, is to the fact, that those who profess to be of Christ, are responsible for these disgraceful scenes in South Cornwall.

On Tuesday of this week, Miss K., by invitation, came to this place. Notice for a lecture, for that evening in the school house, had been given. The people assembled, and just before the time for the meeting to be opened, a man of the place, of the name of G. P. P., rushed ferociously into the house with a club in his hand, and fiercely called out,—"Where is the nigger b——h that is going to lecture here this evening! Where is she! Tell me, where is she!" He continued strading across the floor, for a few minutes, demanding where she was, and then extinguished all the lights, by striking them with his club, the glass and candlesticks flying in all directions. As the people were aware that the spirit of murder was among them, they immediately left the house, but in their departure, one lady who sat near Miss K. received a severe blow from P's. club, on her arm, and a young man was struck on his head. Some of the men took lights and returned to the house to get some things that had been left in the hurry of departure, and found P. and Co. armed with clubs, and looking more like a banditti than civilized men.

There had been notice circulated, that a lecture would be given at the Methodist church, on the next afternoon. P. gave counter notice. The hour arrived for the meeting;—and the congregation assembled. P. and twenty or thirty "lewd fellows of the basest sort," came also. The influential members of the community had been called upon,—to give their countenance against such shocking proceedings, but they stood aloof and kept silence. M. H., a steward and class-leader in the Methodist church was fully apprised of all that was going forward, but said not a word against it. He is a man of influence, and that influence was now on the side of the mob. P. and Co. armed with clubs, were ready for the onset. Some of the armed desperadoes went into the gallery. Those whose duty it was to keep order and who were able to do it, were absent. We thought it our duty to save our lives, which were threatened, and therefore adjourned to my house, amidst the most abusive and obscene language of the mob. We had a good number of respectable people, and three of the mobocrats, one of whom had, the evening previous, said he "would be the death of Miss K." The meeting was perfectly quiet and a good effect was produced.

Mob-law is triumphant at Cornwall Bridge. P. is a man of considerable property. How long he will reign is not for me to say. South Cornwall is not quite so far gone. The civil authorities have I understand, commenced suits against the mobocrats.

Yours, for gospel liberty,

Our friend Samuel Thompson of Poughkeepsie, communicated the following to us some time ago, but it was then mislaid, and as just come to light.

A withering reproof from a Southern Man.

Gentlemen —I attended the meeting of the Anti-Slavery convention at Albany on the 31st of July 1839. At the tavern where several of the delegates put up, the landlord soon after we went into the bar room, and mentioned our being delegates to the convention, and that we expected to be in attendance two or three days, observed that he did not fall in with Anti-Slavery principles—he did not believe it would do to free the niggers—you can never make any thing of them; in the West Indies where they were freed they would not do any thing—they were all now living by stealing from the whites and it will be but a short time before they will cut the throat of every white man in the Islands."

I observed a gentleman sitting near the window smoking, apparently very uneasy, as soon as the landlord had finished his tirade against "Abolitionists, niggers," &c. this gentleman arose, evidently dissatisfied with what he heard, and replied in words to the following effect:—"You talk about niggers—I never could see any difference between niggers and other men—they were just the same, and give them the same chance; you talk about stealing—*you* would steal and so would I steal, and serve us as they are served,—blow us up with the horn by day-light in the morning, and have us ready to go to the field by sunrise with your peck of corn per week, the women compelled to go with their babes and lay them under the fence for the bugs and reptiles to creep over, while they work under the whip. I guess if you or I were going home from work and saw a nest of eggs, or a fowl, we would take them to eat. I am a Virginian—I was born and brought up there; you can't tell me any thing about slavery, I know all about it. I hate to hear men talk in favour of slavery, especially men who profess to be christians, I dont believe in such religion—men that will go to the communion table and partake of the emblems of their dying Savior's love, then hold slaves all their life time, and when they know they are about to die, they will to one drunken son, Bill, Joe, Ben, Jim, Bet and Sal; to another, Harry, Tom, Ike, Phill, Sue, &c. when he knows as soon as he is gone, they will sell them the first chance they get. I hesitate not to say that such a man *can never go to heaven!*"

The landlord attempted to explain, but the Virginian went out, unwilling to hear any explanation at all on this subject.

Upon enquiry, I found the Virginian had been a boarder in the house for a short time before, but as the sailors say, the landlord "waked up the wrong passenger that time." We had no more sacrificing to the deity of slavery while we staid at that house; all was respectful and quiet until we left.

T.

NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1840.

Patience.

If we were required to say in one word, what is most necessary, and at the same time most rare, among Abolitionists, we should say, *patience*; and not among Abolitionists alone, but with all reformers. It is with abolition, however, that we have specially to do, and we shall confine our remarks to that subject. For want of *patience*, more errors have been committed, than for the want of any other virtue. Greater advantages have been lost, greater achievements spoiled, and society altogether has been more retarded for the want of this, than for the want of any other single quality of mind; and simply because the healthy action of all other qualities so much depends on this one.

We remember the circumstance of an American minister being on a religious tour in England some years ago, and having for a long time received no intelligence from home, he began to feel discouraged in the pursuit of his labors. Yielding to the first sense of depression, he soon fell into a state of sore trial and impatience. In this condition of mind, while anxiously expecting letters from his family and his friends, he was one day sitting by a street window, in London, when a little girl passed by, singing,

"Patience is a good thing for old and for young,
It keeps the mind quiet, and bridles the tongue."

This simple couplet raised his drooping spirits, and inspired him with new life. Its effect was as sudden almost as the electric spark. He girded himself about with strength, and prosecuted his journey and his labors with renovated energies.

We do not attribute undue importance to the possession of this sterling virtue. The broken ranks of the abolition host, the diminished confidence in *principles*, the weariedness of some and the defection of others, the dissatisfaction with *simple means*, the seeking after and adoption of new *expedients* for the promotion of a great moral reformation,—in all this, we see the results of a want of *patience*. Men's minds have become possessed of the rage for a lightning speed. They see locomotive engines flying across the country at the rate of twenty, thirty, and even *fifty* miles an hour, and, forsooth, they must do every thing at the same rate. Mountains have been cut through or cut down, valleys built up or built over, the track all *graded*, and every obstacle removed, and the engine flies off faster than the wind. Can men see all this done in *physics*, without wishing for the power to obtain analogous results in morals?—aye, and without believing they have the power? Such seems to be the delusion that possesses them. But they do not reason correctly; they do not even reflect. Let them act on the same principles in morals, as the engineer does in the construction of the road, and they may not be so utterly disappointed. The engineer never *dreams* of departing from fixed *laws*. He has tried them a thousand times, and he has never failed in their application—simply because he *conforms to them*. He is not so silly as to attempt to make *them* conform to his own notions. Let the moralist do likewise. Let him always act according to the simple laws of truth and nature—then he will always succeed.

To go back a little, men are in a real *lightning* fever, as to speed. The American Anti-Slavery Society was formed in 1833. In 1840, they wonder that slavery still exists.—Why, the great Atlantic Ocean was thirty days wide, ten years ago, and now it is only thirteen! And American slavery, so far from being destroyed, has brought *new* levies,—aye, it has brought levies *even from the midst of Freedom's camp*, to battle with its foes! Do we marvel then, that it yet lives? Shall we fly the field, because a ten-years' continuous and vigorous campaign has not destroyed it! No. The first youth of abolition has not grown to manhood! Nay, it is yet in swaddling clothes. When a *generation* shall have come round—when, *only once*, native abolition shall have grown to years of thought and intelligence,—then, if slavery still stand with stubborn front—if it still defy liberty and truth, then *despair*, and not till then. Then grow impatient,—then seek other expedients than those of *simple, primitive abolition*, but not till then.

It has been stated that when Harvey first promulgated the theory of the circulation of the blood, young physicians and students were easily convinced of its truth; but all who were over forty years of age, died incredulous. We may, and doubtless shall succeed in convincing many persons of the justice of emancipation, who have attained or passed the meridian of life; but compared with the whole mass, the number of these will be few. And even if we could convince the majority, of this isolated truth, the work would be but just begun, since there are mighty loads of prejudice and volumes of educational precept to remove, before we could induce legislation on a subject in which they are not directly and selfishly interested. How obvious then, is it, that our chief dependence is on the young and growing mind! It is easily convinced, because it has no long sought and arduously acquired opinions to contend for. It has not become enslaved to the creeds of a corrupt age, in morals, politics, or religion. Nearer to a state of nature, it more easily comprehends the truths of nature, since it is not forced to regard them through intervening fogs.

Shall we then be troubled almost unto despair, because ten years of labor finds us no farther advanced! Rather let us "possess our souls in patience," at least till we find the new soil that abolition fathers and mothers and teachers are preparing, hard and unproductive. But we shall not find it so. In the first manhood of that anti-slavery spirit which has just begun to germinate in the young mind of our country, the American Juggernaut will find its certain doom. Let us patiently abide that day.

Why should we forsake the laws of nature! Why should we be dissatisfied, if those laws are always immutable through the endless changes of time! They will not bend to our notions, we may rest assured, and it is equally certain that conformity to them on our part, will tend more certainly to consummate our hopes, than all the *expedients* of civilians, ecclesiastics, or politicians.

Patience, analyzed, is *confidence*. He who has no confidence in abolition principles, can have no patience to wait for their results; and whoso hath *patience*, will find by examination, that it rests on *confidence*. If we go further, we shall see that confidence in *principles*, is trust in God.

In all that we have said, there is nothing like *fatality*, for though it be true that *principles* have *objects*, and are always undeviating in their operation, it is not less true, that the Great Ruler of the Universe suffers instrumental means to be employed for the promotion of Truth; and happy they who adopt His laws in their simplicity, and become the instruments of His goodness.

We willingly give place to the following communication. It is very far from our wish or intention to present an unfair statement of the doings of the old Executive Committee. Our readers will judge for themselves when informed of the facts of the case, whether we have so done.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Messrs. Editors—I am surprised that you should have so far lost sight of the dignity of the anti-slavery cause, and of that foundation principle upon which it is professedly based, which requires universal love; as to have it in your hearts to slander any portion of our friends, by publishing what I cannot but believe some of your Executive Committee know to be untrue, viz. the slanderous charges made in your last paper against the old Executive Committee of the "American Anti-Slavery Society," while commenting upon James G. Birney's letter from England. As for Mr. B. he is able to defend himself against such charges, if he deems it necessary; but as it regards your charge against the Committee, of which he was a member, alledging that instead of raising $300 to keep the Emancipator alive, *they pledged the property of the "old society" to raise twice that amount, to send Mr. B. to England, &c. &c.*, I feel bound to say is palpably and undeniably false and without foundation. The money for Mr. Birney's expenses to England, was raised by the "New-York City Anti-Slavery Society," and the "Ladies N. Y. City Anti-Slavery Society," by subscriptions and appropriations made and obtained at the time for that express purpose, and so acknowledged by me in the Emancipator, then Treasurer of the City Society. I trust that you will consider it due to the societies who furnished the money for Mr. B.'s expenses, as well as to the Committee you have so unjustly assailed, to publish this note.

LYMAN W. GILBERT.

October 2d, 1840.

Answer to the above.

In Executive Committee, April 16, 1840.

"Resolved, That as the sum of five hundred dollars has been contributed by the friends of James G. Birney towards defraying his expenses to the London Convention, the sum of three hundred dollars additional be appropriated to enable him to fulfil his mission.

"Resolved, That so much as is necessary to pay the three hundred dollars to Mr Birney be appropriated of the subscriptions made at the Cleaveland meeting, and the pledge of the Maine Society."

(Signed,) JOSHUA LEAVITT,
Recording Secretary.

Our friend Gilbert was not aware that more than $500 was appropriated to defray Mr. Birney's expenses to England, or he would not have used such strong language, as "palpably and undeniably false." In the article which has drawn forth his communication, we gave the idea that the Committee appropriated six hundred dollars. We might have been more precise, and regret that we were not. The *point* or *force* of the statement, however, is not weakened. A strict adherence to the literal facts of the case, would have made it *stronger*; so that, while we erred in regard to the amount appropriated specifically for Mr. Birney, we fell considerably short of the whole sum voted for the delegation to England; and the fact exists, beyond denial, that *an appropriation was made for him*, sufficient to sustain the Emancipator until the annual meeting; and at the same meeting and almost in the same breath, Mr. Birney voted to transfer that journal, on the ground that *the treasury was exhausted!!* How exhausted, we ask! ☞ By transferring its contents into his pocket. ☜

Before saying another word on the subject, we wish every body who may read this article to understand, that we act only *on the defensive*. Mr. Birney himself is the assailant, and our friend Gilbert his *second*. It gives us no pleasure to speak as we have done, or as we shall now do, of him or his conduct. Further, we aver that we bear no hatred or ill feeling toward him personally;—we may at least be allowed as much consideration on this score, as Mr. Birney's friends will claim for him, when he attacks Messrs. Remond, Garrison, and Thompson. We do not wish to convey the idea, either that we suppose the individuals spoken of to be always and wholly impelled by a spirit of malevolence. Men act thoughtlessly sometimes, and render themselves liable to more censure than they really deserve. Unscrupulous minds do wrong by instinct, without any special wicked intention. They should not, therefore, be held entirely blameless, and in forming an estimate of human conduct, we ought to remember that it is better to err in an excess of honest zeal, than in the quiet sufferance of moral turpitude.

Another resolution passed by the Executive Committee under the same date, will show that the appropriation was not only *double*, but nearly *treble* what would have been necessary to sustain the Emancipator until the annual meeting.

"Resolved, That the sum of five hundred dollars be appropriated to defray the expenses of Mr. Stanton to London, and that as much of the pledge of the Vermont Society be specially pledged for that purpose."

(Signed,) J. LEAVITT,
Recording Secretary.

From this it appears that the sum of eight hundred dollars was appropriated for the delegation to London—the Treasury was then voted *empty*, and the official organ of the society transferred into other and hostile hands, because it *was* empty!!

It is clear, too, that the property of the Society was *pledged* to meet the appropriation. To render this point "palpably and undeniably" true, we quote another resolution, passed May 7th.

"Resolved, That the Committee, S. W. Benedict and L. Tappan be authorized, in case the specific appropriation should not be received in season, or be insufficient to pay the money for Messrs. Birney and Stanton's expenses to England out of the proceeds of property in their hands, provided it can be done consistently with justice to the creditors of the Society."

(Signed,) J. LEAVITT,
Recording Secretary.

We conceive now that we have made out a case quite as bad as was set forth in our former article, and that we shall not therefore be charged with having aggravated it, as our friend Gilbert supposes. Indeed, there was no need of aggravation. If we had had no other object than to impugn the motives of the Executive Committee, we could not have asked for a stronger case. But such was not our object. It was *self defense alone*; and Mr. Birney being the assailant, has no right to complain, if, in making that defense, we have found it expedient to use the weapons which were wrought and pointed by his own hand.

We take no pleasure in this kind of controversy. It is forced upon us by our enemies, who combine in a high degree the most accomplished jesuitism with the most deadly hostility. They make the loudest professions of pacification, at the same time that they are concocting the deepest schemes of mischief. If they are not *saying* strife, they are *doing* it, and what avails the cry of *peace* with the lips or the pen, while the hands are busy with the battle-axe—no, with the *stiletto*—the battle-axe is too bold and noisy a weapon for New Organization.

Let those who think we have manifested a contentious spirit, withhold their judgment till they shall have examined all the facts that belong to this controversy. They will find that the hostility of New Organization, consists less in *theory* than in *fact*; that it seldom goes without its constitutional disguise by which it is well adapted to deceive honest and unwary minds. Its approaches are not unfrequently marked by great apparent deliberation, as was the case with Mr. Birney, when he stated in the London Conference that most of the Abolitionists in the United States who are in favor of woman exercising her natural rights, are also in favor of the "no government scheme." Doubtless this was credited by the majority of his hearers, notwithstanding the correction of Wendell Phillips. The statement seems to have been made without any object but to lessen the influence and the character of those to whom it was applied.—Also, in his attack on Messrs. Garrison

whose iron rule will yet make them weep and shed tears of regret, *perhaps in vain*. They have waked up a spirit which is as unconscionable as the Devil himself, and whose regard for eternal truth and the claims of God, is as small as can well be supposed. With their fears thick upon them of coming destruction from this party movement, in an hour when to have proved themselves valiant soldiers of the Cross of Christ they should have plied the oar more strongly than ever, they cease like those who give up in despair, and notify all christendom that they go with the tide.

Gerrit Smith, in a letter to Goodell, after the election of 1839, declares his determination, "no longer to oppose a political party," convinced that it would be useless: and the result of this meetness is, that every billow wafts him farther from his God, till he forgets that politics in a partisan character, bewilders the eyesight, and acts as a fatal illusion to cheat him of heaven, and he is found as a bondslave in her service, happy 'mid the clanking of his chains. He knows he is a slave; he cannot but feel it. The goad of his "little Liberty party" demands a sacrifice hard to make. One, too, which in our opinion he was guilty before God in making. He must assume for his party a position which heaps a double amount of suspicion on his head—which makes him belie principles of action, (not mere *measures*,) which he urged upon another with great eloquence and force—which tends to give a form and shape to charges which, prior to this movement, were vague and intangible, and adds a thousand fold to the obstructions lying across his path, in his efforts to reach the public ear, and through it, the public heart.

So with Wm. Goodell. He went to Albany, determined to keep the movement from taking a party form, and at that meeting he succeeded in making them feel slightly the "heaven wide difference between acting in an associated capacity, and that of a *mere party*;" but he has found that they have chosen the *latter*. The other made too large drafts upon "poor human nature;" it demanded *principle*, high, holy, heaven-born principle—the offspring of earnest, powerful "moral suasion:" but the latter went by "selfishness." It cut out a new highway, and trimmed it with locomotives, and go that way it would, and Wm. Goodell has found *his* master, whose behests he must obey. What, then, are we to think of the influences of party spirit, when we behold it enchanting two of its sturdiest foes, who had with great power and skill pourtrayed the inherent and essential wickedness of this spirit, heaping upon it all the opprobrious epithets which they could hunt up? We say, what are we to think of this foul witch, when we see these men to-day in deadly battle against her, and to-morrow lying in her loathsome embrace, and glorying in their change of masters? Shall such a sight lessen our hatred? Shall it win us to their example? Shall it turn them into tempters? Never! We humbly ask of God that he would protect us from a fall so deep, so fatal to our trust in Him as our guide and director. What shall we say of them? We will say, in the memorable language of Gerrit Smith, that they are "political partisans, and overrate the *moral* worth of their party, and entertain expectations which *no* party will ever fulfil;" and that if they would have a clear abolition vision, they must be crucified to political *party*, and give up the idea that it will ever exhibit one particle of honesty in the contests between the principles of heaven, and the corruptions of earth. "Then shall their light rise in obscurity, and their darkness be as the noonday." Then, and not till then, shall the "LORD *be their Light, and* GOD *their glory*." God grant that they may see their error, and cease from man whose breath is in his nostrils and *whose heart departeth from the* LORD, for in so doing shall they find rest.

We notice in the "Pennsylvania Freeman" of September 24, a long article from somebody, who, under the cloak of the first letter of the alphabet, is very much disposed to call our report of the Syracuse Convention in question.—Now we beg to tell Mr. "A." that we shall not abate one jot or tittle of our report of that meeting. Wm. Goodell may call it a "caricature," those who edit journals that differ from him, know full well how much reliance is to be placed upon his report of their "sayings and doings." The editor of the Freeman comes in for his share, but the "Standard and Liberator" are the objects of his special favor.—We just hint as we pass along, to our brother Burleigh, that he better make his "peace at any price," with Wm Goodell, as the King of France is disposed to do with the allied powers in the matter of Mehemet Ali, or else prepare for war; for brother Goodell will not stop at one misquotation: if he does, he will do what he has not done with other journals upon whom he has seen fit to affix the odious crime of "loving *all* men as they love themselves." The editor of the Freeman, we think, knows enough of us, to know that we would not deliberately misquote or misrepresent, and as for our "caricature" of that meeting, we affirm that what we said of the men was true, and of their doings also. We quoted their words from their own lips, to Gerrit Smith about his accepting the nomination. We quoted, that *he* said he had business and conscientious scruples, as arguments against accepting the office, that Alvan Stewart told him that he was not bound by his former scruples or his former course, and wished him to lay them aside for the good of the cause. We quoted Beriah Green word for word, so we did Myron Holley, so we did the logical and ever to be admired argument of E. C. Pritchett, who told Mr. Smith that it was not wrong to hold a wrong power, but the wrong consisted in its exercise. Now we care not if these men should deny that they said any such thing. We do not think they know what they *did* say, and we do know, for we put it down at the time, where it speaks for itself. "A" seems to be disposed to pleasantry, when he plays upon our using the word "*movement*," as expressive of the men who moved in the matter. "A." says he well recollects that we said in an editorial article a few weeks since, that, "there was no hope of success in the anti-slavery movement from a reliance on the truth and justice of the principles of abolition." We deny this as untrue. We never said any thing of the kind. Let "A." furnish us with chapter and verse. Quote it, we say, we never said any such thing. "A." charges us with being favorable to the London Convention, which was to operate by "combined influence," while we complain of the Syracuse Convention for the use of the same means. We did not complain of that Convention on that account, but because it seemed disposed to elevate the potency of associated influence above *truth*.

"A." shows in his remarks about Judge Savage what the principle is upon which he acts in reference to men's anti-slavery character. If a man has done nothing openly and avowedly against our holy cause, he is merely *anti-abolition*. It takes positive opposition to make him pro-slavery. New Organization will thank "A." for this distinction. Pretty argument this, for a man of sense! He that keeps *still* is not pro-slavery, he is merely anti abolition. He that robs God's poor, is a pro-slavery man. He that stands by and sees it done is *anti-abolition*. Wonderful logic! Truly, a second Daniel has come to judgment. We aver that Judge Savage is a vile pro-slavery man, as much so as nine tenths of the North. He is a Van Buren man to boot, has always acted with him; not a member of the Democratic party merely, but a supporter of Mr. Van Buren, and his policy. If he is not, then "common fame" has lied outrageously for the one hundredth time, and the friends of the Judge have backed her up.

"A." charges us with "insinuating, without proof," that Judge Savage is an opponent of abolitionism. It would be well for "A." to *prove* that we insinuated without proof.—It would satisfy any reasonable man that Judge Savage is opposed to abolitionism, that he never has said any thing *for* the slaves of the South. Jesus Christ and "A." seem to have two kinds of moral philosophy. The former says that he that acteth not with him, acts against him: this, "A." stoutly denies. Now, in conclusion, let us say, that "A." would do well to know *that* whereof he affirms, when he talks about our misquoting Mr. Stewart. We tell him that we will stand against the world in our report of that Convention, and challenge any and all to deny any material feature in it.

We observe that the editor of the Freeman has learned from Gerrit Smith, through a friend, that Alvan Stewart said what he did about the "selfishness of the human heart," in reference to the establishment of a paper. We did not deny it: but he said that no reform could be carried on without making "selfishness the basis," and President Green arose upon his sitting down, and made quite a reply, to undo what Mr. Stewart had said. This, all will remember. and what was the establishment of a new paper to do with the reform? Much, every way, but chiefly because, in his estimation, the cause could not go on without such an arrangement; but let "A." remember, that he took occasion to say, "that we must have the selfishness of the human heart as the *basis* of a reform:" these are his words, and let "A." deny them if he can; they went on to paper as they fell from his lips—and "A." is pleased to call them "insinuations." The truth about it is, that Convention was the first meeting the party had held; its development was proportionate. Since that time meetings have been held, large and small, and they have been characterized by the same spirit, if those who attended them may be accepted as judges. Look at the last meeting of this State Society; a mere caucus: J. C. Fuller (see Union Herald, September 24th,) was gagged three times, and withdrew into the gallery—Spencer Kellogg was gagged down by the previous question moved upon him by Wm. Goodell; so says report. These things are what one might look for, when men get so that they can ridicule the weapons of truth and substitute mere human devices—a mere body without a soul—for the holy law of *right*. Enough for the present.

From the Emancipator.

"To what base uses come at last!"

The old American Anti-Slavery Society, which used to make the pro-slavery clergy and press groan with shame, and startle the slaveholders as with earthquake shocks, is now busying itself, by its new organised committee and through its only "organ," in doing the dirty work of party, and circulating groundless slanders and malignant personal abuse against Independent Abolitionists, of a description so low that no whig press could be found to perpetrate them. Even the editor who is employed for this base purpose conceals his person and uses another man's name as his cloak. Happily, the circulation of the said "organ" is quite limited, being about the same with the subscriptions to the Emancipator received in the course of two or three weeks, last month, on the "fifty cents" plan; and its influence must be still less. We advise Gerrit Smith, Thomas Earle, and all others who may be assailed in its columns, to let it earn its own wages. Our warfare is not with the irresponsible. At the same time, we would caution the backers that there are limits, within which only, calumny is profitable to the pockets of its perpetrators.

To whatever extent we may have erred in our treatment of the *third party* scheme, it was with honest intentions, and even if it were otherwise, that would not justify our friend Leavitt in his exceeding harsh language. We cannot, as we love liberty, and desire that all bonds may be speedily broken, refrain from reprobating with sincere zeal, the course which has been adopted by the friends of independent nominations. Our brother Leavitt's extreme sensitiveness seems to argue the absence of perfect clearness in his own mind, as regards the propriety of the movement. Moreover, if he were fully satisfied with the position in which he has placed himself, in other respects, we apprehend it would be easier for him to preserve his equanimity; but knowing the circumstances of his situation, we cannot be surprised by any manifestation of chagrin or passion that he may exhibit. He is the man of all others, connected with the past operations of the American Society, in whom modesty were most becoming; and yet, a bolder is not to be found. As it regards the forepart of the preceding article, we may say this: Before the old ship was dismantled by those who had her in charge, she did surely deal some weighty blows and sore, upon the enemy, and Joshua Leavitt who was a sort of a *sailing master*, and held the *speaking trumpet*, did his part with a steady and a strong hand. Frequent in the rage of the pro-slavery storm, did the loud and clear tones of that trumpet swell upon the blast, and the artillery of Freedom poured heavy broadsides upon the foe. But a change came o'er the scene,—the flag was hauled down—the ship got out of trim, lost her bearings, and drifted among the breakers of "New Organization." Happily, the friends of the good cause rallied, and saved her from total wreck. Once more her flag floats upon the breeze, but it will be no marvel of a considerable time should elapse, before all damage is repaired, and her lost ground recovered. She is now in a fair way however, and depend on it, we shall strike her flag—*only to nail it the faster to its staff*.

Our brother Leavitt offers us a challenge, in effect. He says our circulation is happily quite limited. *Who made it so?* We shall answer, in due time. Waive that for the present, and hear our response. It is this. If the Editor of the Emancipator will agree to throw off all the money that he has received from our subscription list and reckon that only which he has received from subscribers obtained since the transfer, we will consider the propriety of accepting his challenge. Let us see if he has made an empty boast, yea or nay.

Moral Suasion.

Moral Suasion is to the cause of human freedom, what the polar star is to the fugitive slave, who keeping his eye on it, and it alone, is thereby enabled to thread all the labyrinths of the great southern prison house, and to reach that glorious country, the soil of which does he no sooner touch than his "shackles falls." That star may become obscured for a time by clouds, but they are not the star's clouds—they are Earth's. So with moral suasion, the atmosphere of which is always clear and bright—it too is sometimes obscured, never by any thing that belongs to itself, but by the fogs and smoke of *base policy* which ever seeks its own expedients instead of following the never-setting and never-changing light of moral reform. The clouds and smoke of *politics*, the last expedient of superficial reformers, for the abolition of slavery are unlike those which obscure the polar light from the eye of the fugitive—they shed no rain to bless the parched soil, and to revivify nature, but serve only to limit and to obstruct the vision, and to keep off the genial warmth of the sun. A resort to such means, manifests a want of confidence in the laws of God—and a spirit of impatience that is not willing to labor, and wait the results of principles. What if the slave, after a week's toilsome flight from the cotton fields of Alabama were to grow impatient at finding himself yet south of the Potomac and to become dissatisfied with his guide—the never-setting star, and turn to follow some other light—he might wander 40 days or 40 years, fasting for freedom—but he knows better—he keeps his eye on *that Star, and sees no other*, and will not take his eye from it till he crosses the St. Lawrence, and becomes a part of the same nation with Thomas Clarkson and George Thompson.

We learn from the Journal of Commerce that the schooner Amistad and cargo are to be sold at New London. For whose benefit?

Daniel L. Miller's letter, enclosing $15, is hereby acknowledged. When remittances are not promptly acknowledged, either by letter or in the Standard, correspondents should write again immediately, as it may be taken for granted that all is not right.

A friend requests us to ask Thomas Earle whether he is favorable to emancipation by *compensation*. We have heard it so stated, and put the query with feelings altogether respectful. We shall be glad to receive a reply for two reasons—if it be true, voters ought to know it—if untrue, the error should be corrected in justice to himself.

The condensed statement of the doings of the New-York State Society, in another column, is that which was referred to in last week's paper. It was unintentionally left over.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Pro-Slavery and the Rev. Gordon Hayes.

MR. EDITOR:—I wish to make your paper the medium of an "attack upon the ministry;" for that is the name given to every faithful rebuke of pro-slavery in those who minister at the altar of God. We may speak with all plainness, in condemnation of those politicians who disregard the sighing of the bondman, or crush him under their heel, to show their subserviency to his haughty oppressor, and no one thinks we are attacking the State, or warring against the office of ruler; but the moment we demand of the professed ministers of Christ, the same regard for justice and mercy, the same love of freedom, the same fearless adherence to principle, which we require at the hand of the mere politician, forthwith we are denounced as the foes of the ministry.

It is an acknowledged principle among Abolitionists, that a candidate for office who doubts or denies the justice and expediency of abolishing slavery at once and for ever, can have no good title to the name of republican, and is unworthy the support of a friend of freedom. But there is great reluctance to apply the same principle to the clergy of the North, who certainly ought not to be behind the politicians of the day in their advocacy of human rights. In a moral enterprise, shall the Church follow the State? Shall the watchmen on the wall, hold their peace till the whole city is aroused, and still be adjudged faithful sentinels? Shall we require nothing of those to whom much has been committed? Pro-slavery ministers deserve the severest and most unsparing rebuke; for they are a *living* "attack on the ministry" of Christ, who came to preach deliverance to the captive. To expose them, and hold them up in their true character, so far from being an attack, is a defence of his ministry, and none but those who love their *pastor* more than they love their principle, can be offended at such reproof. That those who find themselves revealed in their true light, should raise the mad dog cry, is certainly to be expected.

The Rev. gentleman whose name stands at the head of this communication, is the settled minister of a Congregational church in Washington, Connecticut. He has for several years been the chief obstacle to the anti-slavery cause in this vicinity, as is acknowledged both by the friends and foes of that enterprise. His opposition has been both violent and virulent, and certainly deserves this praise, that it has been undisguised. Among other principles equally abhorrent to religion and common sense, he has advanced the following:

"Men have not inalienable rights, and the assertion that they have, leads directly to infidelity. Slaveholding is not *oppression*; but cruelly beating men while in slavery is oppression. Selling slaves does them no injustice, it only changes their situation, not their relation. God established slavery among the Hebrews; some men call this *servitude*, I don't care what they call it, it was slavery. The angel sent back Hagar, Paul sent back Onesimus, as a slave. We are bound to return fugitive slaves, not to secrete them.—The relation of master and slave is consistent with the law of love, which does not require its immediate abandonment, but masters are required to show the slaves all reasonable kindness, the relation being continued."

Twice have his dear people been edified with attempts to torture the system of Hebrew servitude into slavery; and from one of these was deduced the inference so consoling to tyrants, that, "to enslave man is no oppression." No! To make merchandize of humanity, to convert free agents into brute beasts, to hold the temple of the Holy Ghost as an article of property, to reckon those for whom Christ died, not among sentient beings, but among irrational and brute instruments, is no oppression. This is no abuse. The act has no moral character, or else it is laudable; perhaps it may sometimes become a Christian duty. Paul sent back Onesimus as a slave, indeed, but not as a *slave* "*merely*." He was, at the same time, a brother beloved; just as one who is a member of the same church with the President of the United States, is his brother in Christ, although his subject. Paul says, "Receive Onesimus not *now* as a servant." The Rev. Gordon Hayes says, Paul sent him back not *merely* as a slave, but as a slave he did send him back to his master, Philemon, and Paul's example should be followed by ministers of the present day.

The treatment which Abolitionits, their principles and measures, receive at the hand of this apologist for slavery, is certainly not such as they might expect from a minister of love and reconciliation. To say that misrepresentation and abuse are let loose upon them, and that shafts of sarcasm, winged with sneers and dipped in waters of gall, are the weapons which they encounter, would be very far from the truth; such language would but feebly describe the character of the assault. The grossest insinuations against the motives of the Abolitionists, the most palpable misrepresentations of their principles, and the most scornful treatment of their measures to be found in the violent political papers of the day, would here find their parallel. Every one who faithfully pleads the cause of the slave, is sure to receive his share of abuse; and yet we constantly hear the cry of "Peace, peace:" all excitement is deprecated, and Abolitionists are violently denounced for their denunciatory language and spirit. Take one example of the *mild* and friendly reproof which Abolitionists are wont to receive.

A few weeks since, that noble hearted friend of the slave, Abby Kelley, of Massachusetts, visited this place to plead the cause of her poor captive sisters toiling under a southern sun, and driven to an unnatural labor by the lash of a brutal overseer, in whose behalf the pulpit had never uttered its voice, and whom this watchman had either never seen in their bonds, or else, like the priest and Levite of old, he had passed by on the other side. For the bleeding bondman and bondwoman, this uncompromising and fearless advocate lifted up her voice; and was she received with welcome? was she cheered onward in her labor of love? You shall hear. The next Sabbath the pulpit was not dumb; but from its sacred enclosure was delivered a sermon from the following text: "Notwithstanding, I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman, Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things offered to idols."—Rev. ii. 20. What better passage of Scripture than that could be selected, from which to discourse upon the sevenfold abominations of slavery, and expose the foul crimes of which she is the parent! But no! Jezebel was pourtrayed in all the blackness of bold impiety and hypocrisy, and when the picture had become sufficiently revolting, when language had done its best to describe her character in all its loathsomeness and deformity, the whole was directly applied to the "female lecturer of the past week." Then the battery of sarcasm and invective was unmasked and the vilest slanders ever uttered in a sanctuary of God, were heaped upon the head of that devoted woman. If half the accusations there brought against her character, either by direct charge or by gross inuendoes, were true, her name ought to blacken through all coming time. What, then, shall be said of one who could make charges without even the shadow of proof, many of which, if he knew any thing at all upon the subject, he must have known to be false.

She was directly accused of attempting to destroy the peace, the order, and the faith of the Church. She was represented as "travelling over the country, day and night, with she knows not whom, but always with *men*; husbands leaving their wives to become her knights errant, calling all men brothers." "A non-resisting female" calling every man brother, only think of it. I blush for the sex!" And well he might; for mingled with all this, were the most heartless sneers at female character, language better becoming a satiated libertine than a minister of Jesus Christ, the righteous. Shafts pointed like these, wound not those at whom they are directed, but recoil upon the head of the misguided man by whom they are hurled; and he who slanders a child of God, aims a dagger at his own soul.—Passion and prejudice may sway the sceptre for a time, and a dogged subserviency may echo the sneers of the "respectable and influential," but passion will subside at last, reason return to her throne, and then bitter repentance sought carefully with tears, will be the fruit of such labors.

The Tuesday following this gross attack upon her character, Miss Kelley attended the usual weekly prayer meeting, when, after the exercises were closed, addressing her calumniator in the spirit of Christian forgiveness, and in a manner very different from that which had characterised his discourse on the Sabbath, she meekly forgave him the evil he had meditated against her, and called upon God to forgive him, for he knew not what he did. Scarcely had the first word been uttered, when a murmur was heard around, and amiable women were seen crowding towards the door, as if a lion or a tiger had suddenly sprang in among them. The Rev. *gentleman* himself seized his hat and rushed past her while yet speaking, as if to interpose between her and the other females, and thus make true his assertion, "that she travels through the country always with men." A stranger coming in at that moment would hardly have supposed, from the appearance of the retiring congregation, that they were leaving a house of prayer.

The Abolitionists regard this, not so much as an attack upon an individual, as a blow aimed through her at the anti-slavery cause in this place. 'Tis vain. God will defend both it and her. They expect no aid from the pulpit here. Like the grand sultan's throne, it admits neither question nor reply. The waves of free discussion dash not against its tasseled cushion,—its door turns not on its hinges at the touch of the slave's advocate; it stands above, not among the people; and sheltered behind its rampart, pro-slavery can hurl her envenomed shafts unreturned and unreturnable. But Abolitionists are beginning to inquire whether it is right for them to support an apologist for slavery: they begin to see the folly of building up with their money what they tear down by argument.

This is as it should be. When pastors leave caring for the flock, to take care of the fleece, and think more of *salaries* than *souls*, the cause of human freedom has little to expect from them but opposition. Shall abolitionists foster such opposition? No; verily let their money perish rather. Those ministers whose consciences have descended into their pockets, will be roused by the refusal; but let them beware. "Thus saith the Lord concerning the prophets that make my people err, that bite with their teeth, and cry peace: and he that putteth not into their mouths they even declare war against him: therefore night shall be unto you, that ye shall not have a vision, and it shall be dark unto you, that ye shall not divine; and the sun shall go down over the prophets; and the day shall be dark over them.—Then shall the seers be ashamed, and the diviners confounded; yea, they shall all cover their lips, for there is no answer of God." Micah iii. 5—7.

May they rather repent of their hostility to the cause of the slave, and regardless of opposition and reproach, enlist in his behalf, and thus do works meet for repentance. But till then, let the language of Abolitionists towards them be that of merited rebuke.

VINDEX.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Reply to Thomas Earle.

September 28, 1840.

You think that I did not definitely answer your questions. One would think, dear sir, that you are hard to understand. I said "yes" positively to your first question, and "yes" to your second, if by it you had reference to men; and "no," if you had reference to principles. I will try to satisfy you this time, unless you repeat these questions from a spirit of captiousness, which I would wish to consider you as not doing.

To your first question, I reply yes.

To your second question, I reply yes. Are you satisfied?

You see fit to question me by a long chain of interrogatories, and as "turn about is fair play," I will answer them frankly, and then ask you some dozen or two as my fancy may lead me, or my judgment dictate, and if they, my dear sir, should be questions which you have once declined answering, I hope you will not decline again, since you have seen fit to question me so closely.

To your following questions I answer in their order. 1st, no. I do not admit it; I am in favor of the Whig party only so far as it is in favor of liberty: when it is opposed to freedom, I labor to reform it, not to destroy it, or the Democratic party. The Whig party in the State of New-York is more favorable than the Democratic.

2d, I answer no.

3d, no. But I argue that it is evidence of great thoughtlessness and proof of small regard for principle for men to form a new party, because both Democratic and Whig parties were so corrupt they could not stay in them; and then run to one of the worst pro-slavery men in the country (if a man's character is to be judged by his power to do good and his silence upon human rights) and ask him if he would not like to be Governor of this State, and if he should answer "*heartily*," then they would support him. Wo'nt Mr. Earle tell me where is the difference between the questioning system and the one they have adopted.

4th. Mr. Earle, I think, is rather thoughtless and seems disposed to put questions such as one might suppose a child would put, but I will answer him lest he should deem himself unsatisfied. It would prove a design to break down the Democratic party. Is this plain enough?

5th. Yes, if democratic journals are any proof.

6th. Yes, I refer you to articles in the Evening Post and the Boston Quarterly Review. I cannot tell you the numbers, because I am in the country and cannot refer to them. It is the principle that the property of an individual shall become the property of the State, to be disbursed as the State may see fit at and after the death of the individual. I do not attribute it to you as I do not know what you do believe.

7th. Certainly, if he is an *honest* man, and your doctrine is true that a man is "bound to sustain civil government."

8th. No; but that democrats assert that point and offer it as proof of their superior excellence.

9th. Yes, and offer as proof of the fact, the support on the part of the Whigs, and the opposition on the part of the Democrats, of the passage of a registry law, in this State, also the great efforts made by the Democrats to naturalize foreigners, while Whigs take less pains.

10th. Yes, if they are not sheer hypocrites. Are you satisfied? If so, I will turn questioner, in a moment. All this trouble, my dear sir, might have been saved, had you answered questions I addressed to you immediately upon your nomination. You declined for reasons satisfactory to yourself. I think you will hardly decline at present.

1st then. Do you believe this government is "ordained of God!" If so, how in any other sense than murder or theft or slavery is ordained?

2d. Do you believe that a man must adopt the "Bible as a rule of life," so that he must urge the obligations of a voter by constantly telling every one that he meets, "that he that ruleth must be just ruling in the fear of God!"

3d. Do you believe in the *religious* obligation to vote? If so, must the man you vote for be a religious man?

4th. Do you believe in a man's having the right to suspend his functions as a voter? If so, when?

5th. Do you believe in choosing the least of two moral evils?

6th. Would you, if you could, defeat Harrison and Van Buren without substituting better men in their places? If so,

7th. What would the state of the government be if you could accomplish this end, without substituting better men, but a state of anarchy?

8th. Do you believe that you may lay aside lesser governmental interests for the accomplishment of greater ones? If so, wherein consists your difference of action, and that of him whom you so richly blame for voting for Harrison or Van Buren, except the difference of opinion as to what constitutes the greater interests?

9th. Do you have any confidence in any party, or ought any man to have in a party, who are urging the "divinity of human government," and yet urge voters to sacrifice all other interests to that of *one*, thus neglecting the very things to sustain which they say, "God instituted civil government!"

10th. Do you think men ought to have confidence in a man who lacks moral courage to avow his principles, or declines answering questions, when presented in a respectful, decorous manner?

11th. Do you wish the voters of this country to adhere to a party that has no political philosophy, no definite principles, no well digested system of means to ensure good government, if elected to power, made up of all the kinds of crudities that that exist in the community?

12th. Do you believe woman has as many natural rights as man?

13th. Do you believe government ought to secure *all* in the equal enjoyment of those rights which they hold in common, such as the rights of life, liberty, and property.

14th. Would you have Mr. Birney, if chosen President, use the military power of this union to force the slaves to submission in case of an insurrection? If not, what would you have him do?

When you have answered these questions I will ask you some more.

Yours respectfully,

J. C. JACKSON.

Extract of a Letter from A. Brooke,

Dated OAKLAND, Ohio, September 16.

"The Clinton County Anti-Slavery Society, among other matters, passed a preamble and resolutions on the subject of the division in the anti-slavery ranks, deprecating the separation of our State Society from the American, expressing confidence in the principles of the latter and its present management, declaring it to be the duty of Abolitionists to investigate the cause of the difficulties, alledging, that as both parties cannot be right, we are bound to support the right and to condemn the wrong, and calling for the publication in the Philanthropist of the addresses of both societies, lately published at New-York. * * In reference to political action here, the old and new organizationists, (which are to be, for as yet there is no line drawn between them,) will be found to be very much mixed up. Many who will side with the latter, are much opposed to the nomination of a third ticket—some because they wish to vote for Harrison, others for better reasons, which I have not time or room to detail. * * I believe the favorers of the third party with us, only look to it as a temporary expedient, to compel the other parties to bring out suitable candidates, and such as may be depended upon in the cause of equal rights."

Thanks to our Philadelphia friends for their timely contribution to our Treasury. We hope soon to be able to make many acknowledgments which are due. A great press of employment has alone prevented us from doing it long ago.

Narrative of Stephen Dickenson, Jr.

I shipped on board the steamboat New Castle, commanded by Captain J. D. Wilson, then laying in the port of New-York, in the capacity of fireman. I was to have eighteen dollars for the first month, and twenty dollars afterwards. Robert Garrison and Isaac Wright also shipped in the same vessel, on the same terms. We sailed from this port early in the fall of 1837 for New Orleans, and were about a month on the voyage. After arriving at New Orleans, we traded from there to St. Marks, in Florida, for about three months; about four months after we left New-York, while we were laying at the wharf at the city of New Orleans, near the United States Hotel, a man by the name of Botts, a negro trader, came on board and staid about half an hour conversing with the Captain, and then they both left the vessel together and went up into the city. In about an hour the Captain returned to the vessel and went into the cabin, but remained there but a short time, and again went up into the city. A few minutes after he had left the boat, the mate told me and the other colored boys that we must go with him and bring down some hemp or packing yarn. This article was used for wiping the deck, steam engine, &c. We followed him agreeably to his directions. He took us all to a prison called Harper's Jail, into which we were all put; we became greatly alarmed and enquired of the mate the cause of our imprisonment, being conscious that we had done nothing worthy of such treatment; he told us he did not know the cause but would enquire and call again and inform us, but we saw no more of him; we remained in confinement until the next morning, when Botts made his appearance at the prison and asked us if we were free, we replied that we were; he then enquired where we came from; we informed him we came from New-York in the steamboat New Castle, Captain Wilson, and that she was then laying at the wharf. He then enquired what street we had lived in, in New-York, and who we had lived with: to these questions we gave true answers. Botts then, without making any remark, ordered us all to be whipped. We were taken into the prison yard, stripped, and one after the other tied to a ladder, laying on the ground with our faces down, and each received thirty-five lashes on his bare skin, with what they called a bull whip. He then told us if we ever mentioned the steamboat New Castle, or the name of Captain Wilson, or New-York, that we should have as much more.

As soon as they had finished whipping us, we were untied and returned into close confinement, where we were kept about three weeks; when we were taken out of jail, in the evening after dark, and put on board a steamboat called, I believe, "The Bunkers Hill." Botts pretty soon came on board the boat with chains and chained us, two and two, there being three others taken from the prison, whom he claimed as his slaves, making six in all—one of these strangers said he was free. About seven or eight o'clock the boat left the wharf and proceeded to Vicksburgh, and we arrived there in about two days after leaving New Orleans. Here we were delivered to an auctioneer by the name of Rudisill, who paraded us about the streets for about an hour offering us for sale, compelling one of us to carry a red flag, and another of us to ring a bell. But as no one offered a satisfactory price for us, after remaining at this place about a week, we were put up at auction. But a price sufficiently high not being yet offered, we were not sold. A day or two afterwards a purchaser appeared, bargained for us, and paid the purchase money; but in consequence of information which he drew from us, by asking us questions, he began to suspect we were free, gave up his bargain and his money was returned to him. The next day, in the absence of the auctioneer, this gentleman called to see us and enquired of us if we were free.

Having suffered already so much for saying we were free, we hesitated to answer him, when one of those who had come with us from New Orleans, and who was a slave, told him that we said we had come from New-York and were free; he then questioned us very closely, took down our narrative, and said if he had time he would write to our friends, and then left us; and called upon the auctioneer, Rudisill, and informed him that he was satisfied that we were free, and that if he had time he would see into the matter. In consequence Rudisill wrote to New Orleans to Botts, gave him the information he had received, and requested to know how the matter was. Botts, in reply, directed him to get rid of us as soon as he could and as well as he could—soon after this we were disposed of. Isaac Wright was sold first, but to whom I was not informed, and I never saw him afterwards, until my return to New-York. The separation was painful; we had been acquainted before we left home; we had been companions on board the steamboat New Castle several months; we had been companions in suffering in the jail at New Orleans, and from there to Vicksburgh; but now we were to be separated, I supposed, forever. Next to Isaac Wright it fell to my lot to be sold and James Percival became my purchaser; he had come to Vicksburgh with horses for sale, and he remained there two or three weeks after he purchased me, before he disposed of them; after which he took me to Brandenburgh, Kentucky, and left me with his son Richard, where I was employed as a house servant about three months; he then removed with his family to Hardin County—there I was employed on a farm. I now began to think I should never see my native city or my friends again, and my distress was intolerable, though my master treated me with some degree of kindness. I had enough to eat of that that was pretty good—Indian bread and salt meat. I had before worked on a farm on Long Island, and was some used to farming business and my master seemed satisfied with my performances. The thought of home often rushed upon my mind, when I was at work in the field, and when I laid down to sleep. I lodged in a still house on a tolerably comfortable bed. I lived with this man, Richard Percival, about two years.—There was a person in the neighborhood by the name of Thomas Vantreese, who lived about two miles from my master; he was a kind, pleasant, but poor man; he owned no slaves, but worked himself. He had a small farm of rich land and kept it in very nice order. On it was an orchard of good fruit of various kinds; and I used to go there with the other boys belonging to my master, of whom there were seven beside myself, to get fruit, there being none on my master's farm. Finding Vantreese kindly disposed towards me, I ventured to give him a history of my case. He told me that he thought from my appearance that I had not been brought up a slave. The same week that I opened my case to him, he applied to Lawyer Cradock and showed him my narrative, which he had taken down as I related it to him; and Lawyer Cradock wrote to New-York, and in due time received an answer confirming all I had said. My statement being corroborated by the letter from New-York, Lawyer Cradock, at the instance of Mr. Vantreese, commenced proceedings at law to obtain my release from slavery; and the sheriff called upon my master and made known his business. Fearing he might lose the sum of money he had paid for me, $950, my master set off, while the sheriff was at his house, for Vicksburgh, and took a number of horses for sale and me with him. We staid about a week in this place, sold our horses and spent some time in hunting up Rudisill, the auctioneer, who is an Elder in the Presbyterian Church. At length my master found him and informed him that I said I was free. Rudisill referred him to Botts, in New Orleans, and we went on board a steamboat and proceeded immediately to that city. Here we put up at the Planter's Hotel, Canal street. Although some hope now seemed to dawn upon my mind that I might once more see my home and friends, yet on my way here, and after I got here, I suffered extremely with the fear that I might again fall into the hands of Botts, under whom I, with my companions, had already suffered so much. Upon arriving at New Orleans I made my case known to the landlord, and he acquainted an attorney by the name of Mr. Elwyn, who boarded in the house with him. This gentleman had formerly lived in New-York; he undertook my case, and enquired of me the particulars of it—asked me who I knew in New-York, and many other questions; he became satisfied that my statement was true and commenced proceedings to secure my liberty, and I had been at New Orleans but two or three days before the sheriff took charge of me, and placed me in jail for safe keeping. Here I was kept about two days, when Percival found Botts, and they entered into a compromise. Botts returned $600 to Perciful, and I was set at liberty. Lawyer Elwyn gave me free papers. Perciful proposed that I should go home by way of Kentucky, and after advising with Lawyer Elwyn, I concluded to do so, and left New Orleans in company with Percival, who promised to provide me with the means of returning home, but after he got me as far as Smithland, in Kentucky, I discovered that he had deceived me, for he then told me that it had been agreed, before I left New Orleans, that I must pay him $200, which I knew was false. I now found myself involved in fresh difficulty, but as I knew I was in his power, I could do no other than agree to his terms, I proposed to enter on board a steamboat to earn the money, to which he agreed, and I gave him my note promising to pay him $200, and engaged on board the steamboat Shylock, Capt. Samuel McEwen, then laying at Smithland, in Kentucky, undergoing repairs, at $30 a month. Percival put my note into the hands of Capt. McEwen, and he was to stop the amount out of my wages. My free papers were placed, when I left New Orleans, in the hands of Percival, who paid the expense of having them recorded, and I never saw them afterwards. I was fully aware that I had been imposed upon. When the repairs of the Shylock were finished, I went on board of her at Smithland, and proceeded from there to Vicksburgh. She traded from this place to New Orleans. We made four trips before I could get an opportunity of speaking with Mr. Elwyn; at length I saw him, and he advised me to leave the Shylock, which I did; I had been four months on board of her and received but $15, the balence I expect was received by Percival. I then entered on board the steamboat Camanche, and traded to Manchester, on the Azoo River; here I was to have $25 a month. I continued on board of her two months, when she was seized for debt, and I got but $25 out of the 50 that was due to me. I then hired on board the steamer Columbia, that traded to Galveston, in Texas. I went in her but one trip, for which I received $16. After leaving the Columbia, I shipped on board the steamer Natchez and came to New-York, where I arrived in about nine days, and immediately proceeded to my father's house. I had been absent about two years and ten months. I cannot express the joy I felt on getting home. My father had been overwhelmed with grief, and had almost given me up as lost forever, and upon meeting our rejoicing was mutual. Robert Garrison yet remains in slavery, but who he was sold to, or where he was taken, I never learned, and I never saw him after leaving Vicksburgh the first time.

STEPHEN DICKENSON, Jr.

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Brutal Murder at Dubuque.—The Galena Gazette of the 9th, publishes an extract from a letter written at Dubuque on the 6th, giving the details of one of the most shocking murders upon record. Were it not that the editor vouches for the respectability of the writer, we should be inclined to hope that the circumstances have all been exaggerated.—The account says:—

"I have just witnessed one of the most disgraceful, and barbarous and inhuman murders ever perpetrated in the lead mines. There was a negro man living here by the name of Nat, an old resident, whose principal occupation was that of waiting upon the gentlemen of the town, and whose wife followed the business of washing. They were both considered very useful, though Nat, it was said, would occasionally take, without leave, sundry little articles, such as tobacco, cigars, stockings, &c., which was no doubt the result of a very intimate acquaintance with those who employed him. A few days since it was heralded through the town, that a quantity of clothing had been stolen from a fellow whose reputation is not very enviable. Poor Nat was immediately suspected of the theft, and the collection of a mob was speedily effected, consisting of all the 'loafers' and 'grog bruisers' of the town.

The victim was dragged from his house and conveyed down to the beach in front of the town, amidst the shouts of a drunken multitude, and tied to a post—his back bared, and full three hundred lashes were dealt out to him, "well laid on" in *good mob style*. During the infliction of this most awful and brutal punishment, was *made to confess* in such a manner as to contradict himself, which gave a new impulse to the scene, and their merciless cruelties were continued until his back was literally flayed—cut to pieces. He was then loosed, after having been made to promise to show where the stolen things were. But when they took him to the place which he designated, no trace of the stolen goods were to be seen. Thirty-nine additional lashes were layed upon his fleshless back, with a "will and design" which baffles all description. He was then dragged up the stairs of his house, which he designated (under the most excruciating torture) as the

Dead Friends.

From Poems of M'Donald Clarke.

The azure smile of summer eyes
May charm the young and gay,
But those where sorrow's shadow lies,
Like winter's sundown ray,
Are dearer to the desert heart
That all its loneness feels,
As answering tears will always start
Where gloomy music steals.

Our feelings darken, like the rays
Of twilight through a cloud,
Shading the bloom of boyhood's days,
And hopes, unbreathed aloud:
Hopes—that have cheered us but to cheat,
And gone—to come no more,
Save when in funeral dreams we meet
The forms, so loved of yore.

O sing the mourning songs, my child,
The bleak wild songs of old,
O'er which fond eyes have wept and smiled,
That now are closed, and cold.
Eyes—that life's weeping passions wet
Once with enjoyment bright,
Ere the beams of human bliss had set
In memory's moonless night.

That dreary music brings again
Dreams of far faded years,
Ere happiness began to wane,
And hope was seen in tears;
Names—that are heard on earth no more,
Dim on the burial-stone;
Faces—that looks of kindness wore,
Long—long to me unknown;

Hearts—that with wise attachment beat,
In every trial, true;
Voices—that even reproof made sweet,
For love was melting through;
All that gave childhood's hour its charm,
Embalmed a mother's name,
When to her grave, at midnight's calm,
Remembrance often came.

Then sing the dark old songs that speak
Of sorrow's faithful dead,
And sweeter tears will cool my cheek
Than pleasure ever shed;
For he who lives a little while
In this false world of ours,
Will find them worth the richest smile
That warms but—Fortune's bowers.

Smiles glitter round the velvet path
Of wealth's voluptuous home,
Yet vanish—when the thunder's wrath
And trouble's tempest come;
But tears are pufer tests of truth—
Keep old affections bright,
Long after we outlive our youth,
And life 's—in waneing light.

New-York, Sept. 28, 1840.

Music.

"Music, like a man himself, derives all its dignity from its subordination to a loftier and more spiritual power.—When, divorcing itself from poetry, it first sought to be a principal instead of an accessory, to attach more importance to a sound than to a thought, to supersede sentiment by skill, to become, in short, man's play-fellow, rather than his assistant teacher, a sensual instead of an intellectual gratification, its corruption, or at least its application to less ennobling purposes, had already commenced. As the art of music, strictly so called, was more assiduously cultivated, as it became more and more perplexed with complicated intricacies, only understood by a few, and less and less an exponent of the simple feelings and sentiments that are intelligible to all, it may be said to have lost in general utility and value, what it gained in science, and to have been gradually dissolving that union between sound and sense, which imparted to it its chief interest and influence."

So entirely do I agree with the writer from whom the above extract is taken, that I have often rode back after a morning concert, to my residence in the country, that I might enjoy the superior pleasures of natural music. It was upon such an occasion, while strolling in the fields, that my thoughts involuntarily arranged themselves, as the novelists say, into the following stanzas:

I.

There's a charm and zest when the singer thrills
The throbbing breast with his dulcet trills,
And a joy more rare than the sweetest air
Art ever combined,
When the poet enhances,
By beautiful fancies,
The strain, and entrances
Both ear and mind.
Thy triumph, O music! is ne'er complete,
Till the pleasures of sense and of intellect meet.

II.

Delights like these, to the poor unknown,
Are reserved for the rich and great alone,
In diamonds and plumes, who fill the rooms
Of some grand abode,
And think that a guinea,
To hear Paganini
warbling Rubina,
Is well bestow'd;
Since then, only then, they the pleasures share
Of science, voice, instrument—equally rare.

III.

But the peasant at home, in gratuitous boon,
Has an opera dome and orchestral saloon,
With melody gay from the peep of day,
Until evening dim.
Whenever frequented,
With flowers it is scented,
It seems all invented
And painted by Him,
Who suspended its blazing lamps on high,
And its ceiling formed of the azure sky.

IV.

Oh! what can compare with the concert sublime,
When waters, earth, air, all in symphony chime!
The wind, herds, and bees, with the rustle of trees,
Varied music prolong;
On the spray as it swingeth,
Each bird sweetly singeth,
The sky-lark down flingeth
A torrent of song,—
Till the transports of music, devotion, and love,
Waft the rapturous soul to the regions above.

The following affecting instance of strong attachment in a very young child is taken from the Memoirs of the Duchess D'Abrantes. M. Junot was an elder brother of her husband.

Bonaparte, who knew his worth, was bent upon taking him on an expedition to Egypt; and when Junot the younger obtained leave to visit his family before he set out, he was expressly commanded to bring his brother back with him. Fraternal affection, and the great prospects held out to him, wrung from him an unwilling assent. He took leave of a beloved wife and an idolized infant, his only child, a boy two years and a half old, from whom he had yet scarcely been separated for an hour, and proceeded with his brother to Toulon. Here, however, he completely repented, and too late endeavored to obtain his dismissal. Bonaparte had appointed him a confidential situation on his civil staff, and had too much esteem for his probity to permit him to recede. In despair, he embarked on board L'Orient—in despair, he reached Egypt; and though he never neglected his duties, he never ceased importunately to demand his dismissal. But the general was not to be moved; and it was not till after the departure of Bonaparte himself, that my home-sick brother-in-law obtained leave to return to Europe. But fresh troubles awaited him: the vessel in which he sailed was taken by the English, and with the loss of all the property he had with him, he was, after an imprisonment of some months at Mahon, landed at length on the coast of France. Rejoicing in the thought of reposing at last under his own roof, he reached it to learn that the son he adored was no more. The truly affecting manner of his darling's death was not made known to him till his wife had given birth to another child; but he never ceased to feel for this one a sentiment of greater tenderness than any of his other children inspired.

The cause of this infant's death, extraordinary as it may seem, was the ardor of his attachment to his father. He had bid him adieu, and had seen him depart; but when he found that he did not speedily return, his grief, at first moderate, became ungovernable. For some days, he cried without cessation, perpetually inquiring where was his papa. At length, his useless tears were intermitted; but his sighs, his pallid cheeks, and constant recurrence to the subject uppermost in his thoughts, showed that his grief was not abated. His mother observing, with the acuteness peculiar to a mother's love, that the indefinite idea produced by the uniform answer to his question, that his father was gone away, only increased his distress, at last replied that he was at Bussy, a small estate the family possessed a few miles from Dijon. "Then let us go to Bussy," said the infant, with the first expression of joy he had shown since his afflicting loss. The family made a rule of indulging all his wishes, and affording every diversion that could be supposed to alleviate his sorrow, and a journey to Bussy was undertaken; but the disappointment here experienced added to the malady, which had now taken a deeper hold upon him. In turn, a removal to the houses of all his relations was tried—but in vain: at the end of a twelvemonth, this extraordinary infant, who at the time of his father's departure was one of the finest, most healthy, and animated of children, expired with the dear name of papa still upon his lips.

The melancholy circumstances of this event had been related to me a few weeks after my marriage; and it happened that some anecdotes of extraordinary children formed the subject of conversation at Malmaison one evening, about that time, and I related this interesting tale, then fresh in my mind. The First Consul, who usually did not enter at all into such subjects, paid great attention to what I was saying: and when I had done, asked me whether I had not abused my privilege of historian, and had not of a very simple fact created a romance, the hero of which was a child thirty months old.

"General Junot," I replied, "must be my guaranty, General, for the truth of what I have stated: and I can further assure you, that, far from having added to the affecting parts of my little story, I have curtailed them; and if you heard the same tale related by my worthy mother-in-law, who nursed the poor babe through the whole of its long agony, you would find mine very cold in comparison."

The First Consul walked to and fro for some time, without saying a word. This is known to be his habit when deep in thought. Suddenly, he raised his head, and looking around him, asked for Corvisart, who soon appeared.

"Corvisart," said the First Consul, "is it possible that a child should die of grief, in consequence of no longer seeing some one it loves—its nurse, for example?"

"I believe not," said Corvisart. "At the same time, nothing is impossible. But nothing can be more rare than such a case, happily; or else what would become of us? we could not wean a child."

The First Consul looked at me triumphantly, and said, "I was sure of it."

To this I said, that I thought Dr. Corvisart had been unfairly interrogated—that I begged to put the question to him in its true shape. I then, in a few words, repeated the history of my little nephew. And scarcely had he heard me out, than he exclaimed, that it was quite another case, that a nurse was replaced by a governess, who lavished the same cares upon the child, and gave it food at the hours it had been accustomed to; but that affection, distressed by absence, as that of my nephew had been, might cause death, and that the case was not even of rare occurrence.—"I have in my portfolios," said this skilful man, "a multitude of notices relative to the affections of children; and if you should read them, General, you would find not only that the germs of the passion exist in their young hearts, but that in some children these passions are developed in an alarming manner. Jealousy, for example, will kill, as with poison, children of three years of age, and even younger."

"You think, then, that this little Junot has died of grief, from ceasing to see his father?" asked the First Consul.

"After what Madame Junot has just related, I cannot doubt it; and my conviction is confirmed by her having, without being aware of it, described all the symptoms of that malady of which only beings endowed with the most exquisite sensibility are susceptible. This child is happy in its early death; he would have been to be pitied throughout his existence, and would have met with a perpetual succession of dissappointments."

The First Consul rubbed his forehead frequently while Corvisart was speaking. It was evident that his repeated refusals to permit my brother-in-law's return to Europe were agitating his mind; and I am sure that had the light been directed to his eyes, I should have seen them moist.

"Is Junot, your brother-in-law, still in Paris?" said he.

"Yes, General."

"Will you tell him that I wish to see him? Is Junot acquainted with the nature of his nephew's death?"

"I believe not, General; for my brother-in-law has himself only learned it since his wife's accouchement."

He again passed his hand over his forehead, and shook his head with the air of a person who would drive away a painful thought; but he never permitted it to be supposed that he was long under the influence of any predominating emotion. He walked again the length of the room, and then placing himself directly in front of Corvisart, said to him with comic abruptness, "Corvisart, would it be better that there should be doctors, or that there should not?"

The modern Hippocrates replied to the malicious glance which accompanied the question by one of equal meaning, and parried the attack with a jest.

Extract of a Discourse on the "Emancipation of Conscience."

Delivered before "The Edinburgh Young Men's Association for the promotion of Religious Liberty," by R. E. B. Maclellan.

What peculiar *claim* has the year 1643, that we should be bound never to outgrow the mental stature of these who were then convened at Westminster? That was the era in which Astrology flourished, and men constructed horoscopes, and cast nativities, and marked conjunctions of the planets, and sought to read among the unliving and unreasoning hosts of the firmament, the fate of individuals and of kingdoms.—Are we also to be inoculated with the moony madness of the astrologer? That was the age in which Alchymy had its professors; and studious men in their closets consumed property, and health, and reason, and life, in vain researches after the philosopher's stone, the elixir of immortality, the universal solvent, the sublime alkahest, and the powder of projection. Nay, twenty years after the sitting of the Westminister Assembly of Divines, Helvetius published to the world the account of a man who came to his house in the Hague, and gave him a piece of stone half as large as a grain of rape-seed, with which he transmuted half an ounce of lead to pure gold? That also was the age in which Witchcraft was firmly believed by all classes of the community; it were scarcely too adventurous to assert that there were few ministers at Westminster who did not conscientiously admit the power of old women to travel through the air on broomsticks, or undertake long voyages in egg-shells. In this very city, in 1670, full thirty-five years after the formation of the Confession of Faith, ten women were tried for witchcraft before the High Court of Justiciary, convicted, and condemned to be strangled at a stake and burned. With these facts full in our view, again I inquire, What was there in the general intellectual character of the year 1643, that full-grown men of the nineteenth century should bow implicitly to its dictations, should receive with humble reverence its opinions, and tremble to investigate the basis on which they have been erected? If the Westminister Assembly had chosen to include in their Confession the popular sentiments, and in all probability their own sentiments, on astrology, alchymy, and witchcraft, the faithful would have been bound to receive them as the utterances of infallible wisdom, that belief would alone have been orthodox; and all who doubted or disputed would have been the disseminators of "soul-destroying heresy." Considering the almost universal prevalence of these wild creeds, mad investigations, and fiery superstitions—considering, moreover, that Locke, Reid, Stewart and Brown, had not then analyzed the human mind, detected its hidden operations, and unfolded the laws to which Thought is obedient—what *claim* has the General Assembly that we should be bound forever to its authority, that the judgments of succeeding generations should be 'cabined, cribbed, confined' within the antiquated and narrow circle of its Confession?

Even the condition of Theological Literature in 1643 supplies a reason why we should not give a ready and uninquisitive assent to the theological determinations of that period. Biblical criticism was then in its infancy—nay, in swaddling-clothes. Every one is aware that the members of the Assembly had access only to the received text of the sacred volume. That text stands upon the authority of very few MSS., not exceeding twenty or thirty at the utmost, all of which are modern, all of which are of comparatively little value, most of which were collated by a boy of eighteen years of age, necessarily possessed by the love of amusement, and the averseness from studies proverbially unattractive, by which youth is characterized. Since that day, upwards of three hundred MSS. have been collated by learned men of every creed, whose scrupulousness and conscientiousness cannot be sufficiently admired and applauded. Among others, they have examined the Vatican, the Alexandrine, the Cambridge, the Clermont, the Ephrem MSS. all of which are more ancient than the seventh, and some than the fifth century. Are we of this generation to divest ourselves of the knowledge thus procured. Are we of this generation to divest ourselves of the knowledge thus procured? Are we to close our eyes against the light thus shed upon the sacred page? Are we, because the Parliamentary Confession was ratified two hundred years ago, to cast aside the Biblical labors of Mill, Kuster, Bengel, Wetsein,—Matthai, Aller, Birch, and Griesbach! Year by year, almost month by month, in this age of locomotion, travelers are exploring Judea and other oriental countries, taking ample note of their productions, ruins, languages, phrases, manners and customs, traditionary or consolidated literature; and their researches almost invariably illustrate obscure or difficult passages in the Book of God's Revelation. Nay, from my individual experience, I will venture to predict, that many passages which now seem "hard to be understood," and which therefore "the ignorant and unwary wrest to their own destruction," are destined to become clear and bright by the observations of future wanderers. We of this day excel those of the seventeenth century, both in the amount and the value of our Biblical knowledge. Were not the expression too Irish, we are their ancestors: they were the youth, we the men of middle age; we possess all the knowledge they possessed,—and, in addition, that acquired two centuries in which the human mind has made unexampled progress. Instead of bowing to their dictations, they, if it were possible, should bend to ours.—The sum and character of the theological information attainable during the sitting of the Assembly at Westminster, instead of being a reason why we should receive their determinations without inquiry, is confessedly justifiable ground for not only deferring our acquiescence, but even distrusting the conclusions at which they arrived, using freely the additional wisdom which has been since accumulated, and keeping the eyes of our understandings open for all additional rays yet to emanate from the far horizon.

I scruple not to affirm there are as many varieties of creed among the members of the enslaved churches, as among those who possess the fullest intellectual freedom. Every minister of the Church of England gives his unfeigned 'assent and consent' to the 'Thirty-nine Articles;' yet a controversy has been long maintained, as to whether these articles are Calvinistic or Arminian in their tendency. Hence, some of her divines contend for unconditional election and reprobation as sternly as did the old Genevan Reformer himself; while others denounce them as eloquently as once did the Remonstrants of Dort; and a third party find in the Book of Common Prayer the diluted system of Richard Baxter.—Besides, is it not a matter of historical record, that many even of the Prelates of the Anglican establishment have, despite the anathemas of the Athanasian creed, either secretly entertained or openly avowed the sentiments of Arius? Moreover at the present moment, do not some of the Oxford *literati* publicly advocate, under the title of Puseyism, doctrines and principles which added an additional gloom to what is styled the darkest ages of the Papal usurpation? Did time permit, it were easy to show that equal, if not greater diversity of doctrine prevails in the Church of Rome, and in the Church of Scotland, though the members of the former have all signed the decrees of the Council of Trent, and those of the latter the decrees of the Council of Westminster. Such is the absolute inefficiency of the creeds of Pius IV. Henry VIII. and Calvin I. to produce and maintain similarity of faith among their subscribers. Subscription may, by causing men to conceal their conscientious convictions, and exhibit an external conformity to established *dogmata*, make them traitors, cowards, and hypocrites; but it never can confine them, strictly and irrevocably, to the symbols they have sworn to believe.

As I before mentioned, this is the age of *canting* about Religious Liberty:—What is the religious liberty of these Churches, Established or Dissenting, who swear to the Decrees of Trent, the Articles of London, or the Confession of Westminster? It is a sweet though empty sound void of any intelligible signification, and only useful to hoodwink the unreflecting, to point a period in an oration, to "split the ears of the groundlings." What is Religious Liberty? If it mean any thing, it means perfect freedom of inquiry, in all matters relating to God, and Jesus, and the Bible, and our soul's salvation;—inquiry, unshackled by previous opinions, undeterred by the dictation of our fellows, unmolested by the usurped power of spiritual Rabbis. Besides perfect freedom of inquiry, religious liberty demands that every man shall have perfect freedom of speech, shall openly and publicly make known the results of his investigations, without being thereby exposed to injury of any kind or character, either in his property, his person, his reputation, or his civil privileges. To quote the sentiment which our great epic poet has transferred from Euripides—

> "This is true liberty, when free-born men,
> Having to advise the public, may speak free."

Is this liberty to be anywhere discovered in the creed-enforcing churches? Is it to be found in the Church of Rome? Our ancestors conceived it was not; and in England, after much outpouring of the heart's best blood, they succeeded in casting off the tyranny of the Papal autocrat.—Then were loud pæans shouted till the welkin rung again, and the very stars were shaken with the cries of "Freedom! Freedom!" Alas! poor ignorant slaves!—the name of the tyranny alone was changed; a King instead of a Pope was the anointed head of the Church; Articles sat on the eminence which the Decrees had lately occupied, and the Book of Common Prayer was elevated upon that broken pillar from which the Missal had been shaken with ignominy. With these slight alterations, the spiritual despotism was galling as before. Again the souls of the people were uplifted against priestly dominations; again did the throne of Dagon tremble; mitres and crosiers were trampled in the dust; and the triumphs of a disenthralled empire rose to heaven. Was Religious Liberty then achieved?—was the evil spirit of priestcraft banished to the depths of the Red Sea, 'a thousand fathoms down?' No, no!—the saying of Milton was verified, that

> "New Presbyter is but old Priest writ large;"

the Presbyterian was, and is, equally galling with the Popish or Prelatic tyranny; the Confession ruled (and rules) men's minds with the iron rod it snatched from overthrown mass-books and service-books. He who seeks for intellectual freedom, will find that it exists in Three Churches in about equal proportions, and the expression of those proportions is infinitely less than unity. If I *must* bend and bow before the nod of a Despot, what matters it to me whether the name of that Despot be Pius, or Henry, or Calvin? If I *must* wear festering and degrading irons upon the arms of my understanding, so that I cannot reach them to embrace the fair form of Truth, what concerns it me whether they have been forged and riveted by a Council, a Convocation, or an Assembly? If I *am* condemned to dwell in mental darkness, never to behold the advancing light of the world's growing wisdom, what boots it whether the warrant be dated from Trent, London, or Westminster? If my immortal portion *is* flung into a dungeon, whence I can only peep through the bars upon the brilliant and open world which lies without, am I less a captive, whether the words 'Decree, or 'Article,' or 'Confession,' be graven upon the walls of my prison-house? What, then, is our boasted Reformation? We have freed ourselves from the dictation of Rome, but we exert over the minds and consciences of our brethren a dictation equally stringent, humiliating, and Anti-Christian. We have retained the most obnoxious part of Popery, its sacerdotal domination; we have retouched its complexion a little, altered its proportions a little, changed its garments a little, and baptized it with the name of Protestantism. The principles on which alone the Reformation can be justified, wage an eternal warfare against every species of human authority, supremacy, interference in matters of religion; and nothing more un-Protestant can be imagined, than the attempt to fetter and enslave the mind in its pursuit of Gospel Truth.

It has long appeared to me, that every man who subscribes a human, fallible, uninspired formulary of faith, or enforces its subscription upon others, thereby disobeys our Lord and Master Jesus Christ. The Gospel is pre-eminently a religion which promises *Freedom* to its recipients—"Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty." We have made it a system of slavery—of mental, spiritual, religious slavery; capturing 'the freedmen of Christ Jesus,' and making them serfs to the ecclesiastical potentates of the earth. The Gospel exhorts us to "stand fast in the Liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free:" we have disesteemed the glorious privileges bestowed upon us by the great "Captain of our salvation;" have proved ourselves cowardly soldiers; have deserted the banner of the Cross; have suffered our Evangelical franchises to be wrested from us. Jesus said to his countrymen, "Why do ye not, even of yourselves, judge that which is right?" Alas! most Christians are not permitted to judge for themselves: their Churches, their Ministers, their civil rulers, judge for them; and their duty is, not to enquire or to demur, but to receive in silence and submission the mandates of their superiors. Paul commended the Bereans, because they 'searched the Scriptures daily,' to ascertain the truth or falsity of the doctrines he propounded. Why should modern Christians undertake similar investigations, when their Creeds tell them beforehand what alone must be discovered in the Scriptures? "Believe not every spirit," says the same Apostle;—"Nay, do believe them," say the Reformed Churches; "believe all whose opinions quadrate with our accredited standards." "Try the spirits, whether they be of God," continues Paul;—"Try them not," exclaim the Churches; "that privilege is reserved for our Convocations and Assemblies; you are humbly to receive what we propose, and respectfully to observe what we determine." So are Jesus and the priesthood at variance. He calls upon us emphatically, entreats us earnestly, commands us authoritively, to "search," "judge," and "try;" they impede our searchings, our judgments, our trials, with their Creeds, Articles, Confessions. Say ye, say ye, whether we are to obey God's Christ, or the world's Popes, Prelates, and Presbyters?

Brethren! gainsay, confront, overturn all priestly tyranny—oppose all dictation in matters of faith and conscience—refuse subscription, or even silent assent, to all Decrees, Articles, or Confessions composed by men's device. Liberate your necks from the yoke by which they have been so long oppressed—cast, not from your perishable bodies but from your immortal intellects, the bands by which they have been so long constrained—and stand at length, in the attitude of freemen, 'redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled.' "Call no man Master on earth; for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." Pope, Queen, or Synod, may be the heads of others Churches—acknowledge ye no head but Jesus of Nazareth. Separate yourselves from those who would exercise Roman authority and Gentile dominion over you; and while others say that they are of Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas—of Pius, or Henry, or Calvin—of Trent, or London, or Westminster—let it be your pride and your boast, that "Ye are Christ's."

Bigot.—Camden relates that when Rollo, Duke of Normandy, received Gisla, the daughter of Charles the Foolish, in marriage, he would not submit to kiss Charles' foot; and when his friends urged him by all means to comply with that ceremony, he made answer in the English tongue—ne se by God—*i. e.—Not so by God.* Upon which the king and his courtiers deriding him, and corruptly repeating his answer, called him *bigot*, which was the origin of the term. Though modern bigots resemble their founder in being wedded to the offspring of a foolish parent, viz. their own opinion, they are unlike him in every other particular; for they not only insist upon kissing the foot of some superior authority, the Pope of their own election, but they quarrel with all the world for not following their example. Generally obstinate in proportion as he is wrong, the bigot thinks he best shows his love of God by hatred of his fellow creatures, and his humility by lauding himself and his sect. Vain is the endeavour to argue with men of this stamp—

> For steel'd by pride from all assaults,
> They cling the closer to their faults,
> And make self-praise supply an ointment
> For every wound and disappointment,
> As dogs by their own licking cure
> Whatever soreness they endure.
> Minds thus debased by mystic lore,
> Are like the pupils of the eye,
> Which still contract themselves the more,
> The greater light that you supply
> Others by them are praised or slander'd,
> Exactly as they fit their standard,
> And as an oar, though straight in air,
> Appears in water to be bent,
> So men and measures, foul or fair,
> Viewed through the bigot's element,
> (Such are the optics of their mind,)
> They crooked or straightforward find.

But, ought we not to treat even the most intolerant with forbearance? On this subject, hear what Goethe says, when writing of Voss the German poet.—"If others *will* rob the poet of this feeling of universal, holy complacency; if they *will* set up a peculiar doctrine, an exclusive interpretation, a contracted and contracting principle,—then is his mind moved, even to passion; then does the peaceful man rise up, grasp his weapon, and go forth against errors which he thinks so fearfully pernicious; against credulity and superstition; against phantoms arising out of the obscure depths of nature and of the human mind; against reason-obscuring, intellect-contracting dogmas; against decrees and anathemas; against proclaimers of heresy, priests of Baal, hierarchies, clerical hosts, and against their great common progenitor, the devil himself."

"Ought we to accede to the apparantly fair, but radically false and unfair maxim, which, imprudently enough, declares that true toleration must be tolerant, even towards intolerance? By no means; intolerance is ever active and stirring and can only be maintained by intolerant deeds and practices."—*Chatfield.*

Mirabeau.

"Honore Gabriel Riquetti, Counte de Mirabeau, was born in 1749. Youthful impetuosity and ungoverned passion made the early part of his life a scene of disorder and misery. After having been some time in the army, he married Mademoiselle de Marignane, a rich heiress in the city of Aix; but the union was not fortunate, and his extravagant expenses deranging his affairs, he contracted debts to the amount of 300,000 livres, in consequence of which his father obtained from the Chatelet an act of lunacy against him. Enraged at this he went to settle at Manosque; whence he was, on account of a private quarrel, some time afterwards removed, and shut up in the castle of If; he was then conveyed to that of Joux, in Franche Comte, and obtained permission to go occasionally to Pontarlier,—where he met Sophia de Ruffey, Marchioness of Monnir, the wife of a president in the parliament of Besancon. Her wit and beauty inspired Mirabeau with a most violent passion, and he soon escaped to Holland with her, but was for this outrage condemned to lose his head, and would probably have ended his days far from his country, had not an agent of police seized him in 1777, and carried him to the castle of Vincennes, where he remained till December, 1780, when he recovered his liberty. The French revolution soon presented a vast field for his activity; and, being rejected at the time of the elections by the nobility of Provence, he hired a warehouse, put up this inscription, "Mirabeau, woolen-draper," and was elected deputy from the *tiers-etat* of Aix, from that time the court of Versailles, to whom he was beginning to be formidable, called him the Plebian Count. On the day when the States opened, he looked at the monarch, who was covered with the crown jewels, and said to those near him, "Behold the victim already adorned!" He soon took possession of the tribune, and there discussed the most important matters in the organization of society. He had never at that time conceived the possibility of establishing a democracy in so immense a state as France. His motive for seeking popularity was solely that he might regulate a court which he caused to tremble, but the court committed the fault of not seeking to seduce his ambition. He then connected himself with the Duke of Orleans, from whom he obtained certain sums that he wanted; but soon perceiving that it was impossible to make anything of such a clod, he broke off the intimacy in October, 1789. If he was not one of the principal causes of the events which took place on the 5th and 6th of that month, the words he made use of before and during that time, give reason to suppose he was no stranger to them. The next day he made the King new overtures, and repeated them shortly after, but they were invariably rejected; and he then considered how he should, by new blows, compel the sovereign and his council to have recourse to him. Not, however, till the end of the session did this take place;—and then, by the intervention of Madame de Mercy and M. de Montmorin, his debts were paid, and a pension was granted him. From that time he devoted himself to strengthening the monarchy, and addressed to the King a statement on the causes of the revolution, and the methods of putting a stop to it. It may be doubted whether he could have succeeded in this undertaking; but it is now certain, that, at the moment of his sudden death, he was busied in a project for dissolving an assembly which he could no longer direct. On the 16th of January, 1791, he was appointed a member of the department of Paris, and on the 31st, president of the National Assembly. This being the period of his closest connexion with the court, he wished as president to acquire new celebrity, and show himself capable of directing the assembly; a design which he executed with a degree of address admired even by his enemies. On the 28th of March he was taken ill, and died on the 2d of April, at half-past eight in the morning, aged forty-two. So short an illness excited a suspicion at first that he had been poisoned, and all parties mutually accused each other of the crime; but when his body was opened, there appeared, as the physicians asserted, no marks of violence. When on his deathbed, he said openly to his friends, "I shall carry the monarchy with me, and a few factious spirits will share what is left." At the moment of his death he retained all his fortitude and self-possession; on the very morning, he wrote these words: "It is not so difficult to die;" and at the instant when his eyes were closing, he wrote,—"to sleep." His loss seemed to be considered as a public calamity, and it is remarkable that all parties, believing him to be in their interests,—joined in regretting him. His obsequies were celebrated with great pomp; all the theatres were shut: the deputies, the ministers, the members of all the authoritative assemblies, formed a procession which extended above a league, and which was four hours marching; and his body was placed in the Pantheon beside that of Descartes. In November, 1793, his ashes were, by order of the Convention, removed thence, and scattered abroad by the people, who at the same time burned his bust in the Place de Greve, as an enemy to the republic, and one who had corresponded with the royal family. Thus did Mirabeau verify what he had himself said, 'that the Capitol was close to the Tarpeian rock, and that the same people who flattered him would have had equal pleasure in seeing him hanged.' Mirabeau was of middle stature; his face was disfigured by the marks of the small-pox; and the enormous quantity of hair on his head gave him some resemblance to a lion. He was of a lofty character, and had talents which were extraordinary, and some which were sublime; his felicity of diction was unrivalled, and his knowledge of the human heart profound; but he was essentially a despot, and had he governed an empire, he would have surpassed Richelieu in pride, and Mazarin in policy. Naturally violent, the least resistance inflamed him; when he appeared most irritated, his expression had most eloquence; and being a consummate actor, his voice and gestures lent a new interest to all he said. His chief passion was pride; and though his love of intrigue was unbounded, it can be ascribed only to his pecuniary necessities. In the last year of his life he paid immense debts, bought estates, furniture, the valuable library of Buffon, and lived in a splendid style."—From the article "Mirabeau," in the *Biographie Moderne.*

Appearances—keeping up. A moral, or, rather, immoral uttering of counterfeit coin. It is astonishing how much human bad money is current in society, bearing the fair impress of ladies and gentlemen. The former, if carefully weighed, will always be found light, or you may presently detect if you *ring* them, though this is a somewhat perilous experiment. Both may be known by their assuming a more gaudy, and showy appearance than their neighbors, as if their characters were brighter, their impressions more perfect, and their composition more pure, than all others.—*Chatfield.*

Appetite—a relish bestowed upon the poorer classes, that they may like what they eat, while it is seldom enjoyed by the rich, because they may eat what they like.—*Ibid.*

Argument—With fools, passion, vociferation, or violence; with ministers, a majority; with kings, the sword; with fanatics, denunciation; with men of sense, a sound reason.—*Ibid.*

Bait—One animal impaled upon a hook, in order to torture a second, for the amusement of a third. Were the latter to change places, for a single day, with either of the two former, which might generally be done with very little loss to society, it would enable him to form a better notion of the pastime he is in the habit of pursuing. N. B. To make some approximation towards strict retributive justice, he should gorge the bait, and his tormentor should have all the humanity of an experienced angler!—*Ibid.*

Ballads—Vocal portraits of the national mind. The people that are without them, may literally be said not to be worth an old song. The old government of France was well defined as an absolute monarchy, moderated by songs; and the acute Fletcher of Saltoun was so sensible of their importance, as to express a deliberate opinion, that if a man were permitted to make all the ballads, he need not care who made the laws of a nation. They who deem this an exaggerated notion, will do well to recollect the silly ballad of Lilliburlero, the noble author of which publicly boasted, and without much extravagance in the vaunt, that he had rymed King James out of his dominions.—*Ibid.*

Beneficence—may exist without benevolence. Arising from a sense of duty, not from sympathy or compassion, it may be a charity of the hand rather than of the heart. And this, though less amiable, is, perhaps, more certain than the charity of impulse, inasmuch as a principle is better to be depended upon than a feeling. There is an apparent beneficence which has no connexion, either with right principle or right feeling, as, when we throw alms to a beggar, not to relieve him of his distress, but ourselves of his importunity or of the pain of beholding him: and there is a charity which is mere selfishness, as when we bestow it for the sole purpose of ostentation. We need not be surprised that certain names should be so pertinaciously blazoned before the public eye in lists of contributors, if we bear in mind that "charity covereth a multitude of sins."

Ibid.

Cant—Originally the name of a Cameronian preacher in Scotland, who had attained the faculty of preaching in such a tone and dialect, as to be understood by none but his own congregation. This worthy, however, has been outcanted by his countryman, Irving, whose Babel tongues possess the superior merit of being unintelligible not only to his flock, but even to himself.

In the present acceptation of the word, as a synonyme of hypocrisy—as a pharisaical pretension to superior religion and virtue, substituted by those great professors of both, who are generally the least performers of either, *cant* may be designated the characteristic of modern England. Simulation and dissimulation are its constituent elements, the substitution of the form for the spirit, of appearances for realities, of words for things.

Ibid.

Birth—Low.—An incitement to high deeds and the attainment of lofty station. Many of our greatest men have sprung from the humblest origin, as the lark, whose nest is on the ground, soars the nearest to heaven. Narrow circumstances are the most powerful stimulant to mental expansion, and the early frowns of fortune the best security for her final smiles. A nobleman who painted remarkably well for an amateur, showing one of his pictures to Pouisson, the latter exclaimed—"Your lordship only requires a little poverty to make you a complete artist." The conversation turning upon the antiquity of different Italian houses, in the presence of Sextus V. when Pope, he maintained that his was the most illustrious of any, for being half unroofed, the light entered on all sides, a circumstance to which he attributed his having been enabled to exchange it for the Vatican.—*Ibid.*

Blood—The oil of our life's lamp:—the death signature of the destroying angel. Of blood, eight parts in ten consist of pure water, and yet into what an infinite variety of substances is it converted by the inscrutable chemistry of nature! All the secretions, all the solids of our bodies, life itself, are formed from this mysterious fluid

Ibid.